THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—JULY, 1890.—No. 59.

SALUTATORY.

THE aims of the "AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW" and the mode of attaining them were admirably set forth in the first Salutatory, in January, 1876, by the late Monsignor Corcoran, its first editor. His solid and luminous mind, which united "with the flash of the gem its solidity too," at once gave character to the new publication. His name alone was sufficient to attract and to hold the highest intellects and brightest pens in the Catholic body. No man or staff of men can adequately fill his place. There are in our country individuals quite as learned in special branches as was Monsignor Corcoran, but for catholicity of knowledge, for wide, general, and accurate information, such as is invaluable in a publication like the REVIEW, he had no peer in the New World, and probably no superior in the Old. On the lines marked out by this great pioneer, the new management proposes to work.

The mission of the REVIEW is to the higher intellects, Catholic and non-Catholic, of the country. That mission becomes more momentous every day. Catholics suffer most from the ignorance of learned men, learned in almost everything but Catholic doctrine, history, and tradition. The extent of this ignorance is almost incredible. Most of these men are thoroughly honest, and opposed

not to the Catholic Church but to something which they have imagined it to be, but which in reality is but an attempted combination of contradictory elements; a combination which is of impossible existence outside of human imagination. That wondrous union, as they regard it, of supreme cunning, learning, and audacity, which has held its place for nineteen centuries, which attracted and held captive the greatest intellects of the ages, ought to be to such minds a subject worthy at least of philosophic examination, if not of religious interest. It will be the aim of the REVIEW to explain clearly to such minds the philosophy, theology, and sociology of the old Church. These, like Corinthian columns, at once support and adorn the temple of human society. All men who feel an interest in the stability of our civilization should examine them, and learn their necessary connection with that stability. Civilization must wither here, as it has in every country of the world, without morality; but morality requires self-sacrifice, and self-sacrifice requires adequate motives, and the great doctrines of the Church alone can furnish such motives. To expect the flower of social purity without the stem and root that vivify it, is the blinding superstition of this age. The stem and root are doctrines which underlie and give motive to self-sacrifice. Pluck the flower from them, it retains its perfume and looks as beautiful, but soon it will droop and wither and fall leaf by leaf on the cold earth. As well expect to have science without first principles, as morality without doctrines to sustain it. And these doctrines must be true. "Wars between men may cease," says Edmund Burke, "but wars between principles never cease." By conquest or submission men may cease to fight, but Truth has the communicated life of God. It survives the defenders that have fallen around its standard, and calls forth new guards of honor, whilst Error, like the fallen archangel, though defeated, retains its natural power for evil. The superficial men of our day fancy the best way is to ignore all doctrine, that is, recognize neither army, and thus produce stagnation and call it peace.

From politics, as popularly understood, the REVIEW will continue to keep aloof; but to the ethics of politics it cannot be indifferent. When great moral questions are involved in political issues,

the illumination of sound principles must fall on the dark places of politics and show men that the right alone is the truly expedient, that the poison of one false principle cannot be compensated for by innumerable present advantages, but must course through the veins of the body politic and soon find its heart. We shall endeavor to show that whilst Christianity is a divine institution, primarily designed to regulate man's intercourse with his Creator, it has indirect temporal blessings, second only to its spiritual benedictions. It is the only power to-day that can bring the great contending forces of the world—the rich and the poor—the governors and the governed—capital and labor—together, join their hands as brothers, and impart to them the blessing of the Founder of Christian civilization, Who was the unitive principle of all parties—Himself rich and yet poor—a ruler and a subject—a capitalist and a laborer—the King of Kings, and the carpenter's son and co-laborer.

The REVIEW will also have a scientific character, and endeavor to keep abreast with its contemporaries in this department. If there be any charge against the Catholic Church which her educated children more indignantly repel than another, it is that of being opposed to science and education. A single reflection ought to convince any thinking mind of the *a priori* absurdity of such opposition. All truth must be, of course, harmonious with itself. What is religiously true cannot be scientifically false, nor can what is scientifically false be religiously true. Now it is clear that the religious man is fearless of scientific investigation in precise proportion to the depth of his conviction of the truth of the religion he professes. But it is generally conceded that no persons have deeper convictions of the truths of their religion than Catholics; whether these convictions be rational or not does not affect the argument; therefore Catholics must be the last men to fear science, and, for the same reason, knowledge of any kind. But fearlessness inadequately expresses our position. We love science; for, truth is always holy and of God, whether it is in the natural or supernatural order, for both orders are equally of divine institution. The Catholic Church has been, to a great extent, the educator of the world in both orders. In her schools were the greatest intellects informed and developed. She taught St Augustine his philos-

ophy, and St. Thomas Aquinas his theology, and Christopher Columbus his navigation. She founded the great Benedictine, Dominican, Franciscan, and Jesuit schools, and to-day consecrates hundreds of men and women to the cause of education. She founded the present great universities of Europe, and filled them with more students than they can boast of at the present day. In the light of reason and of fact, this charge against the Church would seem absurd, yet is it daily insisted on by the ignorantly learned class of which we have already spoken.

The REVIEW will also have a historical and biographical character. The deeds of the past and the men who performed them are often sadly misrepresented by partisan historians and biographers. The clouds of prejudice that rise from the valleys of the heart, rest on the head-lands of the intellect and obscure truth. Bigotry and calumny, like grave-rats, gnaw at the coffins of the dead. But as living men have a right to their reputations, so have the dead, and it is justice as well as chivalry to defend them.

It seems almost needless to say that the REVIEW will continue to be thoroughly American. The fact is, that in this century the American and Catholic spirits seem identical. All the discordant elements of the world meet here, and are moulded into one heterogeneous mass by the spirit of the country. That spirit is generous enough to respect racial and national idiosyncrasies, but strong enough to insist that they shall be so modified as not to interfere with the one harmonious national character. This is precisely the genius of the Catholic Church, diversity in unity—unity in diversity. Under no other constitution in the world does the Church find herself so perfectly at home.

Catholics give their heartiest allegiance to the government of the country. Nor is that allegiance neutralized or lessened by the spiritual obedience due to Pope or Prelates, no more than the allegiance of non-Catholics is influenced by the authority of their preachers or by their personal opinions of the obligations of a higher law. The greatest patriots that ever lived have been Catholics. We should bear in mind that the bishops of the Catholic Church "are appointed by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God" in conjunction with the Sovereign Pontiff, that these bishops love their country as dearly at least as do no-popery

fanatics, that the Pope himself is no irresponsible spiritual Czar, but the subject of a higher law and must administer the laws of the Church. Thorough students of the great wise system of the Catholic Church, though non-Catholics, have praised that system, nor seen the fancied danger of divided allegiance.

We beg to add one word of a somewhat personal character. Whilst feeling it an honor to occupy the place of directing editor of the CATHOLIC QUARTERLY, we feel also that our position at the head of a large diocese will not permit us to give the time and attention necessary to the successful discharge of its duties. We shall give to these duties all the time we can afford, but must depend to a very great extent on the excellent associate editors whom we have selected.

Contributors will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors.

† PATRICK JOHN RYAN.

PHILADELPHIA, May 24, 1890.

THE "IMPREGNABLE FORTRESS."

PRINCE BISMARCK AND THE CENTRE PARTY.

THE world's attention has not yet been withdrawn from the hermit in spite of himself, who, at this moment, in his castle of Friedrichsruhe, is given time to reflect on his own eventful life; for, it has been one which marks an epoch in the history of nations.

Endowed with an extraordinary combination of great qualities, Herr von Bismarck will always rank among those who, in the sphere of their activity, have dominated a whole century.

He has devoted to the service of a great cause, viz., the unity of the German States under the empire of the Hohenzollern, genius of the first order and an iron will; and, having been seconded in his gigantic undertaking by unparalleled good fortune and by circumstances propitious beyond the most sanguine expectations, both his friends and enemies must henceforth count the Chancellor of the first three emperors of Germany among those whom mankind styles great.

But has he been great in every respect? Has he been in the hands of God, like a powerful and formidable instrument, imbued with the consciousness and the firm purpose of being such an instrument? Or, has he been one of those agencies which carry out and execute the designs of Divine Providence, in spite of themselves, but caring little for its laws? Has he shown, in the choice of means, as true nobleness of soul and greatness of character as he has energy and tenacity of purpose?

Did might overpower right in the mind of Herr von Bismarck? It is useless to give an answer now to this question. It would be only a blow inflicted on the dead or dying lion. It is all the more useless, because the facts themselves prove, with evidence clear as the noon-day, that the chancellor of "blood and iron" has demonstrated that for him, as for Napoleon the First, "politics had brains but no heart."[1]

---

[1] Bismarck protested in the session of the Prussian Diet (March 13, 1863) that he never said, "Macht geht vor Recht," "might takes precedence of right." Count Schwerin immediately replied to him that, in any case, the policy of the minister culminated in this Machiavellian motto; the then premier did not dare to give the lie to

Emperor William II., who extorted from his all-powerful minister the "*cedo majori*," has many a time loudly proclaimed:

"He was a man, take him for all in all,
I shall not look upon his like again."

But it is doubtful whether the chancellor's warmest admirers will ever say of him:

"O what *a noble mind* is here o'erthrown!"

Such is the man we must speak of constantly, in the following pages, intended to give a glimpse of the history of a small phalanx whose struggles have been all the greater, and whose victories are are all the more glorious when we remember the strength of the adversary against whom it contended.

For it remains true, and no historian, having the least claim to impartiality, can ever deny the fact, that during his long career of repeated successes on the political battle-field, the formidable chancellor has never encountered upon that ground any other adversary, before whom all his influence, all his strength, all his cunning,—in a word, all his omnipotence have been vain and useless.

On glancing at the twenty-eight years during which he directed the destiny of Prussia, and of all Europe, Bismarck beholds along the path which he has followed, the ruins he has left in profusion everywhere. He sees thrones which he has cast down, empires and kingdoms which he has dismembered, majorities and chambers which he has crushed, ministers whom he has consigned to oblivion, ambassadors whom he has annihilated, political parties which he has pressed to the wall and influential men whom he has cast aside; but, in thinking of a certain little phalanx of ever intrepid souls, in reflecting on the battles he has waged against them and of all the means with which he has striven to triumph over them, he will repeat, and, to be frank and honest, he must repeat, the words of Tacitus, "*Triumphati magis quam victi sunt!*" and say, with the proud Roman:

"Cuncta . . . . subacta
Præter atrocem animum Catonis!"

This "Cato," indomitable in spite of all artifices, this party triumphant in the midst of the most desperate struggles, this phalanx invincible in every attack, this army so weak and, nevertheless, so powerful and always victorious, is the Catholic party of the parliaments of Germany. It is "The Centre Party," called by

---

this retort. We think that the ex-chancellor of to-day would be understood to still less contradict the evidence of facts.

Already in 1862, Bismarck, who then had just been called to the Presidency of the Ministry, speaking before the House, said: "It is not by speeches and decisions of the majority that the great questions of the time are to be settled,—that was the mistake of 1848 and 1849—*but by iron and blood* (*durch Blut und Eisen*)."

the most competent and impartial of all judges in such a matter, by Herr von Bismarck himself, *the impregnable fortress, der unüberwindliche Thurm.*

Is it not a touching spectacle for every noble and generous heart to behold weakness the conqueror in a struggle against force; to follow in one's mind the destinies of a political party which grows more loyal to its principles and, therefore, more powerful, as the number of its adversaries increases? This is, indeed, a study, doubly interesting at a time when parliamentarianism is doing so much to bring itself into discredit in the eyes of its own warmest supporters. If we do not disguise the fact that, as Catholics, we are proud to call such men ours, and that we find a double satisfaction in recalling their struggles and victories, we trust it will not be said of us that we have taken sentiments for reasons and desires for facts.

I.

The Character of Parliamentarianism in General in the German Empire and in the Kingdom of Prussia.

That we may estimate accurately the career of the Centre party, we must, first of all, distinguish clearly the two parliamentary fields upon which it displays its activity: The "Reichstag," that is, the Parliament of the Empire, and the "Landtag," the Chambers of the Kingdom of Prussia.[1]

The war against Austria in 1866, which Herr von Bismarck, according to his own confession, had been plotting ever since his accession to the Prussian Cabinet in 1862, had taken away from that Catholic power the leadership in Germany and had transferred it to the Protestant dynasty of the Hohenzollern.

The creation of the North German Confederation ("*Norddeutsche Bund*"), under the King of Prussia as chief, was the result. The crushing defeat of France shortly after removed the last obstacle to the unification of the German States. The "*patriotic anguish*" ("*angoisses patriotiques*") of M. Rouher and of his sovereign, Napoleon III., who realized the growth of Prussia, was silenced; and the Empire of Germany was proclaimed at Versailles on January 18th, 1871. Henceforth the King of Prussia bears the titles of "*Deutscher Kaiser, Kœnig von Preussen,*" Emperor of Germany and King of Prussia.

The empire ("*Das Reich*") has, by its constitution, an essentially federative character, and *must* in no way absorb the government and legislative powers of the many states, kingdoms, grand duchies, duchies, princedoms, etc., which form parts of it. The King of

1 The intelligent reader will understand that we are forced to give an insight into the situation, to show in a clear light the struggles, efforts and energy of the Centre party.

Prussia is especially "*der Oberste-Kriegsherr*," the Commander-in-Chief of the army of the whole empire, in the name of which he can declare and wage war.

Thus Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Saxony, Baden, Hesse, etc., have, as well as Prussia, their own kings, grand dukes, dukes, princes, etc., and their chambers; in a word, their *own constitutions.*

The empire, as such, has only one parliament, the "*Reichstag*," whose members are elected in the different States by *universal suffrage.* It pertains to the Reichstag to propose and vote all legislative measures applicable to the whole empire.

The complement of the Reichstag is the "*Bundesrath*," composed of delegates chosen, not by the people, but by *the governments* of the different States. All the laws of the empire must be passed on by the Reichstag, approved of by the Bundesrath and signed by the emperor.

The ordinary mouth-piece of the emperor in these corporations of the empire is the Chancellor, "der *Reichskanzler.*"

The representation in the Reichstag and in the Bundesrath being proportioned to the importance and population of the States, it is easy to conceive the predominance of Prussia in both Houses; and with such a Chancellor as Herr von Bismarck, who sneered at majorities when he could not manage them as he desired, who imposed his own will on his colleagues in the Bundesrath, as well as on the emperor, we might well exclaim: *The empire, it is the Chancellor.*

His power was such that he had not even to resort to the refusal of the imperial signature for nullifying any proposed law that had been passed by the Reichstag; he simply buried it in the Bundesrath in which he had taken good care to secure the exclusive nomination of men blindly devoted to his policy, putting in practice the motto of Cæsar: "*He thinks too much; such men are dangerous.*"

Catholic Bavaria, ruled by an insane king, and later by a "*liberal*" regent, under the administration of Dr. von Lutz, sent to the Bundesrath only creatures of this apostate, strutting beneath the rays of the Bismarckian sun. Hence we can understand how, during the last few years, anti-Catholic laws, after having been abrogated by the almost unanimous vote of the Reichstag upon the proposal of the Centre party, were maintained by the Chancellor, thanks to the veto of the Bundesrath.

The Kingdom of Prussia, since its very foundation, and by reason of its origin, has preserved a well-marked Protestant character. The Catholics, who were few at the beginning, were deemed citizens of the second order, "*Staatsbürger zweiter Klasse.*"[1]

[1] In his political testament, Frederick I., first King of Prussia, advises his successors to uphold the "Evangelical religion," "because through the Reformation *and the*

The annexation of Catholic Silesia, under Frederick II., did not change the situation. In 1815 two other provinces, viz., Westphalia and the Rhine province, almost entirely Catholic, the finest and richest portions of the kingdom, were incorporated with Prussia. The Catholics then constituted a third part of the Prussian population, but King Frederick-William III., did not cease to consider himself as the protector of Protestantism and to exercise his royal "episcopate" (Summepiscopat) even over the Catholics, who were forced to submit to every kind of harassing laws.

The Constitution promised, in 1815, to the Catholics for the protection of their rights, was never granted during his long reign (he died in 1840). A kind of an agreement with the Holy See, implied in the Pontifical Bull, "*De Salute Animarum*," in 1821, was faithfully respected so far, as all the concessions therein granted *to the Protestants* against the Catholic Church were concerned. In short, never before the accession of King Frederick William IV. had Prussia been "ein paritätischer staat;" Catholics were never held to be equal to Protestants.

Frederick William IV., possessed of a noble and generous heart, was the first to break with this so-called Prussian tradition. The Revolution which burst forth during his reign (in 1848), in harmony with the social commotions in neighboring states, was a consequence of the bureaucratic absolutism of his predecessors, with which some of his ministers were still indoctrinated. During this Revolution Catholics gave many proofs of their devotedness and faithful patriotism, and *the Constitution of the 31st of January, 1850 was their reward.* The equality of creeds; the abrogation of the "Placet;" freedom for the Religious Orders; the nomination of priests restored once more to the now independent bishops; parochial schools; religious teaching given exclusively by ecclesiastics—such were the concessions of the new Charter, which inaugurated for the Catholics in Prussia an era of peace and flourishing development. We shall see that this happy state of affairs did not last long, and that the Prussian tradition was soon re-established. The Constitution gave birth in Prussia to the parliamentary régime. According to provisions of the national Constitution, the legislative power is vested in the *King*, the *Herrenhaus*, and the *Abgeordnetenhaus*. This last is the Assembly of the representatives of the people, the *Abgeordneten*.[1] These

secularization of the principalities, which was a consequence thereof, *the power of our house has been considerably increased;* moreover, if the Pope were to regain his influence, our house would lose much of its grandeur." See Bachem, *Preussen und die Katholische Kirche*, p. 10.

[1] The House of Lords and the House of Representatives constitute the Prussian *Landtag*. The latter corresponds to our Congress or Legislature. An *Abgeordneter* of the Landtag means always a member of the lower House.

members are elected by the famous system—an election of three "degrees." Each municipality chooses its electors, "Wahlmänner." These go to the chief town of the district and publicly, in loud voice, select their candidates in the presence of a delegate of the government sent expressly to preside over the election. When we consider that absolute independence of character is necessary for exercising the office of a "Wahlmann," the courage displayed by the Catholics in increasing the ranks of their deputies is the more praiseworthy at an epoch when the fact of voting for a candidate of the Centre party sufficed to inflict upon the elector the *blot of an enemy to the country, and to make him incapable of holding any public office!*

The *Herrenhaus*—House of Lords—is composed of the heads of certain noble families, who by right of birth belong to it; then, of the delegates of the large cities; the great landowners; the delegates of the universities; and lastly, of those appointed by the king. The Herrenhaus does not belong to any particular party in the ordinary sense of the word. Still less can this be said of the Catholic members thereof, who, being very few in number, have been incapable of any efficient action.

In his struggle against the Church, Herr von Bismarck availed himself of radical measures for paralyzing the influence of the few conservative Protestant members whom the Chancellor's liberalism had frightened. He begged the Emperor to make his authority absolute by creating an amply sufficient number of Herren, absolutely docile to his orders. As the Centre party did not exist in the Herrenhaus, we have no need to dwell on it. Let us recall, however, in passing, that a few Catholic nobles, the Duke of Ratibor, Count Frankenberg, etc., have gained for themselves a questionable notoriety by disavowing the efforts of their co-religionists, and by claiming to be favorable to a hybrid, spurious Catholicism called State-Catholicism. It is true that others, such as Prince Radzewill, Count de Brühl, Count de Hompesch, and almost the whole Rhenish and Westphalian nobility, have largely compensated for that base servility, by their noble and courageous attitude, upholding one of the finest mottoes of nobility, "*More honor than honors*" (Plus d'honneur que d'honneurs).

It is worth mentioning, that the two Chambers of Prussia have never acknowledged the Constitutional system, in the meaning applied to this word in other countries, such as England and Belgium, where the defeat of the majority leads, as a rule, to a change of the ministry. The Prussian ministers do not depend upon the Chambers, nor are they responsible to them for the royal acts bearing their signatures. During the twenty-eight years that Bismarck was president of the Cabinet, the famous formula, "*The*

king reigns but does not govern," had no other meaning than "*the king reigns but Bismarck governs!*"

Most certainly, his declarations of absolute devotedness to the Emperor and King were sincere, but we can easily understand that no heroic effort is required to proclaim one's self the servant and vassal of a superior whose will is inspired by and bent according to our own fancy. Herr von Bismarck has never stood exclusively upon the same platform with any party in the German Parliament. He accepted the majority, wherever it resided. The so-called Conservatives, with or without prefix,—Conservative, Old Conservative, Free Conservative,—became soon the reverse of the true Conservatives, and (with but few exceptions) blindly followed the programme of the man whose absolute preponderance knew how to triumph over the old Protestant orthodoxy. The Liberals, or National Liberals (as they call themselves in their vain self-conceit), Bennigsen, Lasker, etc., humbled themselves before the golden calf, as soon as he yielded to their hatred of the religious orders and granted them rich offices.

The "Progressist party," Richter, Virchow, etc., proclaiming war against bureaucracy, demanding more extended constitutional rights, have been, especially during the later years, the most implacable adversaries of the prince-autocrat. But this did not prevent him from accepting with eagerness their co-operation whenever they waged war on the Catholics, and when he could make use of their hatred against religion, thus giving the lie to their own motto, "*freisinnige*—friends of liberty." Even the Catholics themselves received fulsome flattery from him in acknowledgment of their undoubted patriotism whenever some salutary and economical law, otherwise in conformity with their programme, could not be enacted without their support. Such was the field on which the small army of the Centre party had to operate. Let us now see how this group was formed, what was its flag, what battles it had to wage, and how far they succeeded.

II.

The Origin of the Centre Party and its Programme.

Is the Centre party a *political* or a *religious* party? The answer to this question will throw great light on the whole spirit of the movement.

Herr von Bismarck and the entire Liberal section have, more than once, declared that the Centre party had no right to sit in a political assembly, because it was a *religious party*, and that this fact alone was sufficiently indicative of bitter enmity and war against the government.

Let us analyze this idea. Is not the Centre party a political party? Yes; it has always inscribed on its programme the just and impartial solution of all political and economical questions which were the order of the day at the time of the elections. Yes; it has always been a truly constitutional party, and has loudly and repeatedly proclaimed its fidelity to the monarchy and its devotedness to the true interests of the people. Yes; the Centre party has always proclaimed the rights of truth, of liberty, of fatherland, and in all matters affecting the internal and external policy of the country it has always struggled against "bureaucratism" and centralization, demanding a just and equitable administration in Prussia, the preservation and protection of the federative character of the Empire.

Is the Centre party a *religious* party?—a party organized only to protect religious interests? No; it was formed at the very epoch when an impartial king had just granted to his people so great a concession of liberties as up to that time had been unknown in Prussia. It was in 1852 that sixty-one Catholics of the House formed the *Catholic fraction* which, in 1859, adopted the name of the "Centre party." A religious party? That is to say a party seeking to acquire privileges for a definite creed? No. This party demands that the constitution shall not be a dead letter. It asks that religious liberty, as well as every other kind of liberty, shall no longer be the exclusive privilege of the Protestants.

A religious party? Yes. It is also a religious party, if you will. The men who constitute it are religious men. They do not admit the atheism of the State any more than that of the individual. And, furthermore, they recognize in their faith the truths which religion teaches them; the precepts she gives them as their guide both in their public and private life. They do not share the opinion of those who pretend that they are bound to lay aside in the lobby with their overcoats and umbrellas, their religious convictions in order to be neutral as members of parliament. A religious party, that is, one which will protect religion? Yes, they will guard their religious liberty above every other liberty, because it is the most precious and fundamental of all; and if politics consist in being anti-religious, then the deputy of the Centre party will always be your adversary; he will avail himself of his right of legitimate defense to protect, in his own name and in that of the people, freedom of conscience, liberty of faith, and the liberty of his holy mother, the Church.

Yes, yes, in this sense the Central party has been, and still is, a religious party, as any party composed of true and firm believers must necessarily be. We will say more. No man can be truly a statesman, truly politic, if irreligious; if he is not imbued with

that truth emanating from the very nature of things and testified to by your very hatred of religion; if he does not admit that religion and God are the foundations of all great social and political questions. In fine, we will say: Yes, the men of the Centre party are religious men, because they are tolerant; because of all intolerance that of irreligion is the worst. The facts of the case proclaim this truth. From 1862 till 1869 Bismarck never reproached the Centre party of the Landtag with not being a political party, for the religious persecution had not yet been inaugurated. The first indications of the premeditated assault upon the Church were made in 1869, in Berlin, on the occasion of a riot instigated against the *convents*, when the Centre party did not fail to unmask the perfidious hypocrisy of Liberalism.

The great events and political transformations of the year 1870 introduced the kingdom of Prussia into a new phase of its national existence. The empire, being proclaimed, was to receive its constitution. In their quality of citizens, of Catholics, and partisans of the old Centre the Catholics were obliged to concentrate their forces in order to meet the new condition of things.

On the 11th of January, 1871, fifty-one Catholic deputies constituted again the *Centre Party in the Landtag;* and on the 21st of March, of the same year, sixty-one members of the "Reichstag" formed a party with the same name, *in the Imperial Parliament.* Their programme remained the same, though broadened to answer the new situation. Their motto was: "*Für Wahrheit, Freiheit und Recht*,"—"For Truth, Liberty and Right."

At their head stood Mgr. Ketteler, *the great Bishop of Mayence*, and among the laymen, von Mallinckrodt, the brothers Reichensperger, von Savigny and Windthorst acted as their executive committee. Catholic Bavaria had sent such eminent men as Prince Löwenstein, Baron Franckenstein, Dr. Jörg. The aristocracy was also most worthily represented by the Barons Schorlemer-Alst, von Heeremann, Counts Ballestrem, Bissingen and others. The mere names of Liegens, Lieber, Buss, Lindau—not to mention others—were, in themselves, equivalent to a platform. MMs. Moufang, Westermeyer, Majunke and others worthily represented the clergy. Here we must recognize the fact that German Catholics esteem their priests in a high degree, and show them a marked preference in social affairs. They know full well that the priest has the same rights as any other citizen, and that his education and profound knowledge place him in the foremost rank; that his sacred character and his highly social mission are the surest guarantees of the sincere, disinterested and unbiased devotedness which a representative owes to the interests of his electors. The other members of the "Centre Party," far from

feeling uneasy at seeing men in cassocks in their group, considered themselves honored by having such companions in Parliament. On one occasion, Herr Windthorst said: "We acknowledge that we wish to have among us some members of the clergy. There are many questions in which their advice and experience are valuable and quite often indispensable at a time when the politics of our adversaries consist in attacking Catholicism."

In the preliminary meetings which preceded the definitive formation of the "Centre Party" in the new Reichstag they had long and earnest discussions as to the appropriate name to be adopted by the party. Some proposed to call it the Catholic party ("Katholische Fraction"), whilst others, especially MM. Windthorst and Reichensperger emphasized the name "*Centrum*" (Centre), as better showing forth the principal objective scope of the party, which was, *the defense of all the constitutional liberties, as well in behalf of Catholics as of Protestants.* Their opinion prevailed, and in order to express still more clearly the character, essentially and truly conservative of the party, they called it "*Centrum-* oder *Verfassungs-Partei*" (the party of the "Centre," or of the "Constitution.")

It is explicitly stated in its written statutes, that the party is not exclusively Catholic; that, on the contrary, all Christian believers can become members if they adopt its political and constitutional programme. Thus, from the very beginning down to the present time, several Protestant deputies have frequented the meetings of the "Centre Party," have constantly voted with it, in quality of "*Hospitanten*," that is to say, without having their names inscribed as members. Others, namely, MMs. von Gerlach and Schulz, have been received into full membership; Herr von Gerlach, a venerable man, and a true conservative of the old stock, has been constantly elected by a Catholic constituency. As Catholic Ireland, so also does Catholic Germany furnish the strongest proofs against the charge of Catholic intolerance and fanaticism!

The little army was now formed, but it was on a peace-footing, and its formation was in no way the result of Catholic mobilization. It was ready to enlist under the flag of the new empire. Mgr. Ketteler expressed its views, when he said: "We unreservedly acknowledge the newly-founded empire; we will defend its unity, although we intend to guarantee to every participating State that independence which the common welfare admits." But will Herr von Bismarck permit the Catholics to occupy a room in the new dwelling, which he is just going to roof?

O, yes, Catholics of Germany, you are a thousand times right in proclaiming loudly that you love the Fatherland dearly; that you love its glory as much as do any of your fellow-citizens; that your

sons have watered with their blood the soil of France from Strasburg to Paris; that your priests, your friars and nuns have wrought prodigies of charity under the deadly volleys of guns and chassepot rifles; that your bishops, your priests, your press and your orators have enthusiastically and unanimously celebrated the great and glorious victories of your armies and the foundation of the German Empire. All that is true, very true; but do you not know Schiller's:

> "Der Mohr hat seine schuldigkeit gethan; der Mohr kann gehen?"
> "The negro has done his duty; the negro can go?"

And do you not fear that it may be applied to yourselves? Do you not know that nothing is more elastic *than the word patriotism?* In all times despotism has forged it into a weapon against its most innocent victims. It is useless for you to say that you crave nothing but liberty, equality and common rights for yourselves and for others. Know ye well that your being Catholics is in the eyes of many your greatest crime; that your foes will declare that you are mere strangers, not children of the Fatherland; that you are enemies of the country and of the empire, "*Vaterlandslose*" "*Reichsfeinde*," and that it is high time to deprive you of your common rights?

If, then, you wish to claim a place in the new empire, you will be forced to conquer it by the greatest sacrifices; nay, more, by far harder-fought battles than those of Sedan and Metz!

III.

The "Kulturkampf."

This word, invented by the socialist Lassalle, and applied by Prof. Virchow, the atheist and progressionist deputy, to the campaign inaugurated against the Catholics in behalf of "*culture*," sums up all the horrors of a religious persecution, which Mgr. Martin, Bishop of Paderborn (who died in exile in 1879), did not hesitate to call "a new *Diocletian persecution.*" We will only touch the psychological problem, how could a man like Bismarck disregard so totally the lesson written in blood upon every page of history, and foretold by those divine words: "The stone which the builders of this world rejected, the same is become the head of the corner. Whosoever shall fall upon that stone shall be bruised, and upon whomsoever it shall fall, it will dash him to pieces." —Luke 20, 17 and 18.

Pius IX., in his celebrated allocution of Christmas, 1873, condemning the Kulturkampf, uttered these memorable words: "It is not only with secret machinations, but with brute force, that they try to exterminate Catholicism in the new German Empire. Men who not only are not of our holy religion, but *who do not even know*

her, dare to arrogate to themselves the power to determine her dogmas and rights." *Ignorance and prejudice!* Ignorance of a religion which it is enough simply to know in order to respect and appreciate her civilizing power; prejudice, blindly nourished, especially by Protestantism, and carried to hatred; these are the principal causes of these most violent attacks upon the Church of Christ. "*Hoc unum gestit, ne ignorata damnetur.*" "We ask only that you do not condemn us without examination." But like Tertullian, we must ask it in vain, as long as time shall last; for the "*dixit insipiens*" will remain true of God and His works, as long as men, blinded by their passions, or their prejudices and pride, "*veritatem in injustitia detinent.*"

We class Prince von Bismarck among these latter.[1] From the very beginning of his diplomatic career as Prussian ambassador to the Bundestag of Frankfort (1852), he proclaimed publicly by word and by writing that some day or other "*the open fight*" against Catholics must "begin in Germany."[2] That thought matured in his mind the nearer he approached the realization of his gigantic undertakings, which were, from the *national standpoint*, the *supremacy of Prussia in Germany as a consequence of the defeat of Austria*, and from an *international point of view*, *the preponderance of the German Empire over the Latin races in the affairs of Europe by the downfall of France; and on religious grounds, the intensifying of the Protestant character of the new empire, both at home and abroad, by the destruction of Catholic influence.* Well persuaded that "*violenta non durant*," especially in the domain of conscience, he tried first, upon the occasion of the Vatican Council, to make use of the *Catholic bishops* themselves as instruments in his anti-Catholic crusade.

Count von Arnim, equally ambitious and intriguing, and a pos-

[1] Bismarck was never an Atheist. He himself made public profession of his Protestant orthodoxy, and on a certain occasion declared in the Chamber, "To me, life without belief in supernatural Revelation is simply inconceivable."

See the three letters of Bismarck to Emperor William published a short time ago, in which the Chancellor touchingly pictures the domestic joys of the devout Christian in the holy season of Christmas. These same letters show how completely the minister had gained the confidence of the emperor, which he was shrewd enough to take advantage of, making him believe that he had no other desire than to fulfil the will of his master. According to the biography written by his amanuensis, Busch, Bismarck is a member of the fanatical sect of the "Bohemian Lutheran Brethren," and every evening before retiring, he is accustomed to read a portion of the "Daily Watchwords of the Brother Congregations."—*Taegliche Lesungen der Brüdergemeinde*, Busch, *Graf Bismarck und seine Leute*, p. 128.

He had, however, little love for Catholics, or for the Catholic Church, nor did he ever understand Catholic teaching. He is very superstitious. He will refuse to sit down at a table where the number of guests is 13, and Friday is for him an unlucky day.—See Majunke, *Geschichte des Culturkampfes*, p. 11.

[2] See Poschinger, *Preussen in Bundestag* I., p. 320.

itive hater of Catholics, was sent to represent Prussia at the Vatican. His instructions from his chief were, to encourage opposition in the German bishops to Papal infallibility, both before and after the definition had been given; to promise them the fullest support, and, if necessary, to threaten Prussian legislation against the Catholic Church "in case the Council could be terrified by the cry of *schism*."[1] The German bishops were therefore expected to take part in, and, in fact, to begin the struggle. By separating themselves from Rome, the centre of unity, and drawing the people after them, they were to seek a "a reconciliation" with Protestants, as was preached by the apostate Döllinger, and thus gradually to accomplish their amalgamation with the "German National Church."

This plan, however, proved a total failure, because of the fidelity of the Catholic bishops and their Catholic flocks, who remained steadfast, even after the Piedmontese government, encouraged by the notorious despatch, "*Maintenant ou jamais*," sent by Bismarck from Sedan, had taken possession of Rome. Then, more than ever, the captive Pontiff, Pius IX., became the centre of unity for the Catholic world, and especially for the Catholics of Germany.

Moreover, the war against France, which was proclaimed simultaneously with the dogma of infallibility, also served as an instrument in the hands of Providence to prevent, at least for the time, any effectual support being given to apostasy.

Even on the battlefield, and under the very walls of Paris, Bismarck never lost sight of his plan to obtain the mastery over the Catholic Church.[2]

Emperor William was indignant at the outrageous robbery committed against the Pope, and showed himself inclined to favor an intervention in his favor, when the Archbishop of Posen, now Cardinal Ledóchowsky, together with some Catholic nobles, urged him to take that step, but Bismarck soon succeeded in changing his mind. Already, at Versailles, he entered into an agreement with some members of the Conservative and Liberal parties that, in the new constitution of the empire, Catholics should not be allowed the freedom of worship then granted by the Prussian laws. And, while still in France, he succeeded in gaining over the Emperor

[1] See Majunke, *Geschichte des Kulturkampfs*, p. 29. It will be remembered that in 1874 Count von Arnim, then ambassador to France, was recalled by Bismarck, condemned in court, and sent into exile, where he died, and thus added another important chapter to that great record "*de mortibus persecutorum*," which God Himself has written in the history of the world.

[2] According to a report in the *Figaro* of September 14, 1882, Bismarck said at Rheims, 1870, to Werlé, the mayor of the city: "*The Latin races have run their course; they have but one element of power left—religion. When we shall have become masters of Catholicism that influence will soon disappear.*"

to his future campaign against the Catholic Church. Thus, the "Kulturkampf" had already been agreed on in principle, and was soon to be included in the constitution of the empire as a permanent institution to serve as the authentic sanction of "The Protestant Empire."[1]

The time had come, indeed, for Prince von Bismarck to repeat, "Now or never." Having made up his mind for the religious war, he could not hope for a more favorable moment to begin it. Centuries might pass without offering the same propitious circumstances.

The two armies seemed very unequally matched, both as regards numbers and resources. The one was sure to crush the other at the first onset. It was led by a general whose diplomatic achievements, proverbial energy, and dazzling successes, might well defy all competition, and even comparison. None of the neighboring nations were to be feared.

The most powerful Catholic peoples were suffering from the disastrous consequences of destructive wars. Italy rejoiced to find such a powerful ally of her perjured and parricidal policy. Russia applauded the imitation of her own brutal and Cossack treatment of Catholics.

Add to this international co-operation, so propitious for Prince von Bismarck, the fact that the internal condition of the empire warranted the expectation of a sure victory, and you can see why the emperor and the whole imperial household (except the noble empress Augusta, who was forced to remain silent) deemed the time come to awaken again with redoubled energy the anti-Catholic traditions. The chiefs of the secondary states of the empire, mostly Protestant, had not the least desire, or at least lacked the courage, to oppose the designs of the man whose herculean power threatened to annihilate them. The good and pious king John of Saxony, who, as a faithful Catholic and devoted patriot, appealed to Berlin in his apprehensions, was soon convinced of the uselessness of his efforts.

An army so formidable, both in point of numbers and by the prestige of its astounding victories, was ready to suppress the least token of disobedience to existing law.

All political parties, of whatever complexion, whether of the empire or of the kingdom, joined hands eagerly against the "common enemy,"—that is to say, against Catholicism, represented by the small phalanx of the Centre party. Were not all these exceptional circumstances well calculated to dazzle, nay, to blind the intellect of a man whose heart had always cherished an aversion

[1] For particulars, see *Majunke*, p. 32 *seq.*

to Catholics? Moreover, this man, so fully convinced of his own prowess, and intoxicated with his victories, this man, who, in the presence of the national Chamber and of all Europe, flings in the face of the Pope and the Church the celebrated defiance: "No, I will never go to Canossa, either in body or in spirit!" Had this man been compelled to face a formidable army, there can be no doubt how he would have answered the question of the poet:

"Contre tant d'ennemis que vous reste-t-il?"

He would have certainly replied, in the haughty words of Médéa:

"Moi! moi, vous dis-je, et c'est assez."

But it was not enough. No, all those kings and princes, all those soldiers and artillery, all those allies at home and abroad, all that prestige, all that influence, all the cunning of that extraordinary man, did not suffice to annihilate that little band, which is strong and invincible in spite of its weakness, because it upholds the cause of God and of His Church, because it feels within itself all the strength and superhuman consolation which its divine Master bestowed upon it in the words: "Fear not, little flock."[1] Oh! yes; the Centre will feel the wounds you inflict upon it. More than one of its champions will fall on the field of battle, but like the mountain oak of which Horace speaks, the very iron with which you wound it gives it strength:

"Duris ut ilex tonsa bipennibus
Nigrae feraci frondis in Algido
Per arma, per opes, ab *ipso*
Ducit opes animumque ferro!"

The struggle will be a stubborn one. At times you will think that you have subdued your enemy, but his strength returns, and you, though invincible, will be crushed beneath his heel. Nay, more; from afar, you yourself behold with wonder and bitterness the perennial, youthful vigor of your foe, whom your emperor and your successor take by the hand to place him henceforth in the front ranks of an army which, without his support, cannot save civilization:

"Merses profundo? Pulchrior evenit
Luctere? multa proruet integrum
Cum laude victorem."

It was in March, 1871. The Emperor William I., escorted by all the princes of the blood and a brilliant military staff, appeared

[1] Luke, vii., 32.

for the first time in the Reichstag. He was received with enthusiastic cheers. Conservatives, Liberals, Progressists, and members of the Centre, greet him with the same enthusiasm. The speech from the throne had just been read, after a last cry of "Unser Kaiser lebe, hoch! hoch! hoch!" The day was appointed for debate on the most fitting answer to be given to the imperial message. That answer was drafted and submitted to the Assembly by Herr von Bennigsen.[1] Did that address clearly and candidly usher in the Kulturkampf? No, that would have been imprudent and indelicate. One passage, however, there was in it which was calculated to astonish the Catholic members. Its object was to intimate to them, at the very beginning of the session, that the Pope, howevever grossly insulted, despoiled, and imprisoned, need under no circumstances look to the empire for any assistance whatsoever. Had the Catholic members petitioned for any such assistance? Not at all. Such an intimation, then, must wound them deeply. Certainly. That was precisely the intention of those who introduced it. Their object is to draw them into a snare. They are to be stigmatized as "Ultramontanes," branded as "Particularists," as men thinking only of their own religious interests even to the detriment of the empire. In covert terms, Bennigsen at first alluded darkly to certain "foreign influences," which, he said, had been detrimental to the late "German empire." By this, official relations with the Pope were plainly alluded to; and in order that all might understand that the new empire had no need of his Holiness; and that the situation of the Pope in prison met with the entire approval of the Parliament, Bennigsen had inserted in the address the following words: "The days of interference with the affairs of other peoples will never be seen again, never, under any pretext or occasion whatsoever." It was the formal, explicit, and official declaration of the so-called principle of "non-intervention." When the discussion of the address began, Bennigsen himself explained fully the bearing of this declaration. He said: "We affirm most vehemently, that the new empire will, at no price, be a party to a Germanico-Italian or Germanico-Christian policy."

What attitude was there for the Centre party to take in the presence of such a provocation so poorly disguised? To sign the address such as it had been drawn up, would be to approve of a false and dishonest principle; it would be to admit a modern error condemned by the Church; it would be, in fine, under existing circumstances, to consent beforehand to play the part of dupes,

[1] Herr von Bennigsen is a citizen of Hanover. In 1866 he gave himself body and soul to Prussia. He became the leader of the "National Liberal Party," and has since then been Bismarck's right hand in all parliamentary intrigues.

and submit to see themselves forever condemned to silence in the halls of parliament. The party did not deliberate long, and their decision, quickly arrived at, was in keeping with the principles of justice and the dignity and loyalty of true representatives of the people. Herr Reichensperger took the floor and said: "Gentlemen, my colleagues and myself are entirely willing to sign the address to the emperor. Our patriotism is second to none. But do not ask us to assent to a pretended principle which every conscientious man must reject. There is no question of the Holy Father at present. We never alluded to him here. What you propose is a theory, and a theory which is as contrary to common sense as to natural and Christian law. How long is it since the duty of helping one's neighbor when his house is on fire has been abrogated? Let us hope that we may never be required to lend such assistance, but at the same time let us not begin our work by proclaiming a policy which no statesman can honestly accept."

But the majority had decided otherwise; Bismarck who, during his whole political life had never ceased to interfere with the affairs of other States, either by threats, which he called "cold-water jets" "kalte Wasserstrahlen," or by diplomacy, instigated both Liberals and Conservatives to uphold the Bennigsen address. That address gave him a weapon against the Centre party.

A vote was reached on March 30, 1871. The reply proposed by Bennigsen was carried by the overwhelming majority of 243 to 63! This same division of the House, by a steady vote of 63 from the Centre party continued till 1879, that is to say, during the entire existence of the Kulturkampf, which Bennigsen had just proclaimed in the name of his master.

The *Reichstag*, faithful servant of the Chancellor, carried out *his will to have an anti-Catholic empire!*

The reader may be inclined to believe that now it is clear who were from the very beginning the enemies of the empire. Who else could be meant? Did not the Centre party, by its attitude, prove its hostility to the Chancellor and his followers and consequently to the empire? Did not the Centre party stir up the first dissension in the bosom of the new-born Reichstag? Could not its members simply and plainly sign the address as it was formulated? How did they dare to arrogate to themselves the right of correcting Bismarck's plans? Was such a party a patriotic one? No, certainly not, it did not love its country; for it was not ready to sacrifice its principles to Bismarck's policy. That party looks to Rome and obeys the Pope, and its true master dwells in the Vatican. What then is to be done with these men who are in truth foreigners, anti-Germanic in feeling? We cannot expel them all from the empire, but we will strive to blot out that anti-national

party from Parliament; then we will subdue the electors who have sent them to us by uprooting from their hearts a religion which dictates to them so provoking an attitude; and that religion against which we are going to wage war is not Catholicism; no, we respect Catholicism. It is Ultramontanism, it is Jesuitism, it is Romanism! Therefore every man must be against Rome! Let that be our battle-cry!

Such was in truth the pretext, as ridiculous as it was perfidious, of which Bismarck and all his tools availed themselves for so many years to justify their attacks upon the Centre party and the Church! Such was also the repulsive and degrading hypocrisy with which they designed to wound, torment and exterminate Catholicism, in promising the people "to free them from the yoke of Rome!"

At first, Bismarck conceived the ingenious (though ridiculous) plan of destroying the Centre party through the instrumentality of the Pope himself! Count Tauffkirchen, a Bavarian, had succeeded Count d'Arnim as minister to the Vatican. This poor diplomat, so proud to represent the emperor, informed Cardinal Antonelli, according to his instructions received from the chancellor, that the Catholics, and especially the Centre party, were hostile to the new empire, and as a proof he furnished a falsified report of the discussion upon the text of the reply to the imperial message!!! This secret manœuvre seemed at first to be a success, thanks to diplomatic lies, but it fell flat and failed miserably, much to the chagrin of the double-dealing chancellor and his over-servile ambassador. A letter from Cardinal Antonelli to Mgr. Ketteler (June 19, 1871), assured the valiant soldiers of the Centre party of the full sympathy of the Holy See "in their defense of the rights of conscience and of religion."

Their enemies were therefore compelled to resort to open persecution, though, of course, under the guise of law. "*Habemus legem, et secundum hanc legem, debet mori!*" It is true, these laws did not as yet exist, but it is an easy thing to make them, with a majority at one's back! Catholics will not accept them; so much the worse for Catholics. They shall be held up to the world as rebels, as revolutionists, and every exceptional measure will be lawful against them. The law factory was set in motion and worked with a speed that astonished even the 19th century, which is so fertile in laws, and therefore so poorly endowed with genius and intelligence to make them.

The Reichstag gave the signal. "Religious liberty" was erased from the constitution of the empire; Herr von Blankenburg, the bosom friend of Bismarck, and all the Conservatives, the Jew Lasker, the freemason Treitschke, with the whole Liberal party, the Progressists Richter, Rickert, Virchow, in a word, the whole "co-

alition," cheered the declarations of the Bavarian liberalist, Dr. Marquard: "We have begun the fight against Ultramontanism; we will push it to the end!"

In order to reduce the clergy to silence, the famous "Lex Lutziana," against the alleged "abuse of the pulpit," was passed, which forbade a priest to utter any word "that might seem capable of disturbing the public peace," punishing such violation *with imprisonment!*

Herr Wagener, a servile tool of the Chancellor, took charge of the ignoble duty of carrying through a bill by which the Jesuits, and all "affiliated orders," were banished.[1] The *Master* himself ordered the Bundesrath to decree that all religious orders then existing in Prussia, Franciscans, Redemptorists, Lazarists, etc., were so "affiliated." Millions of bayonets were not enough to protect the empire against the monks entrenched in their formidable fortress, the convent cell, and armed with that deadly weapon, the Rosary. "*Heraus mit den Reichsfeinden!*" The Colossus trembles before them; therefore, they must be banished.

It was thus the *Reichstag* gave the signal for the Kulturkampf; the real war, however, had to take place in the *Landtag*, for the *Kingdom of Prussia must furnish an example to the other states of the empire in the struggle against Rome*, "*im Kampf gegen Rom*," as minister Falk declared openly in the Chamber.

From the very beginning, the president of the Cabinet (Bismarck) intervened personally in the debate, and proclaimed, in language the most violent, the great principle: "Exclude the priest from the school! The school belongs exclusively and entirely to the State!" The new school law was passed, because, cried out Bismarck, "the Protestant empire is threatened by Catholicism!" And "Abgeordneten" and "Herren" answered, Amen.

There were, however, in the eyes of the minister a few "National Catholics," viz., such apostates as made up the small following of Reinckens, the man sacrilegiously consecrated "bishop" of the "old Catholics," or rather "new Protestants." What a valuable aid have we not here for the formation of the "national church!" Let us, then quickly enact laws for his support and protection, that thus we may attract Catholics to his fold!

Such laws are passed. The apostate is recognized as a "Catholic bishop," with a yearly salary of 48,000 marks ($12,000). Catholic churches are placed at his disposal, possession of the same being given by the gendarmes and soldiers; his "curates" receive large salaries; in short, the Chancellor imagines that now the Pope must tremble. A new enemy has been specially created for him.

1 Later, Herr Wagener fallen into disgrace, died a pauper in 1889, abandoned by all his former friends.

But of what use is the Pope? Has Prussia any need of him? Not at all. Therefore, let us destroy the Papacy, at least in Prussia! Let us strike at the same time both the bishops and priests; let us stop their salaries; let us put these revolutionists in jail, or, if necessary, expel them from the country! But to do that, you will be compelled to *amend the Constitution*, and that is a delicate and odious matter. Granted; but he who wills the end must will the means also; we have a majority obedient at our beck whenever there is question of laws against Catholics. Let us put the question to a vote, and all will be accomplished!

Hence the passage of the famous May Laws (voted in 1873–4); absurd, iniquitous laws, a Draconian code, which show plainly that the man of blood and iron would stop at nothing to prepare a *Sedan* for the Catholics. These laws declare expressly that Catholics must not acknowledge *any ecclesiastical disciplinary power outside of Prussia*—the nomination of priests shall *no longer depend upon the bishops*, but upon *the state*, whose supremacy, even in religious matters, both bishops and priests shall acknowledge *under oath*—the state shall have control of the *education of the clergy*—the exercise of the ministry by a bishop or priest *without the consent of the state* is deemed *illegal*, and will be *severely punished*—an Ecclesiastical Court,[1] composed of laymen, apostates, or Protestants, shall henceforth pass judgment in all ecclesiastical affairs, and shall show special favor to the turncoats!

Yes, yes, indeed, such were the laws made, not in China, not in Russia, but in Prussia, and in the intelligent nineteenth century; and, what is worse, they were brutally enforced! Many bishops and hundreds of priests were deprived of their office, imprisoned, exiled; others, robbed of their income and reduced to poverty; the ministration of the sacraments to the dying was made a crime when proper authorization had not been given by a Protestant governor! Marriages and baptisms were *declared invalid—risum teneatis!*—by the Protestant Falk, a man of overweening self-conceit, whom Bismarck had made minister of worship! The census of the clergy became impossible in Prussia. All the seminaries were closed! The Catholic clergy, faithful to conscience, were forced to give up their positions; the press was enchained; editors were sent to prison for the least offence against his majesty, the Chancellor, who had full authority to call to task all "Bismarck-Beleidigungen!"—reflections on Bismarck—and all this "to protect the Fatherland," to "propagate true civilization," to establish "internal peace!"

---

[1] "Kirchlicher Gerichtshof."

Oh, yes, they did establish that peace! They enjoyed it during the hottest struggles of the "Kulturkampf," when they had dispersed the shepherds and silenced the flock! It was, indeed, a mournful peace; more dishonorable to Prussia than that of Frankfort was to France. It was, as Mallinckrodt so forcibly termed it, "the grave-yard's peace!"—"*der Friede des Kirchhofs!*"

THE CENTRE PARTY IN BATTLE.

Portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam! These words pronounced by Jesus Christ guarantee the immortality of the Catholic Church, but they cannot be applied fully to the Catholic people of any particular country. The history of the apostasy of more than one nation, notably of England, proves this sad truth. But, it is equally true, that the faith of a people devoted to the Church, of a people struggling for the liberty of their religion, is preserved by the immortality and indefectibility of the Catholic faith in general. In every case Catholics lose their faith only through their own fault; when, on the other hand, they bravely and heroically uphold it, they have always been and always will be invincible. The history of the Catholics of Germany, like that of the Catholics of Ireland, furnishes us with a new proof of this truth, as consoling as it is remarkable.

Our subject does not demand of us to speak of the admirable example given by the glorious Catholic episcopate of Germany, by the Ledochowskys, the Melchers, the Krementzes, the Martins, the Brinkmanns, and so many others, whose truly apostolic constancy has won for them that eloquent fraternal tribute of the American hierarchy: "You are made a spectacle to angels and to men!" Neither can we enter into any details so as to do justice to the incomparable zeal, the unshakable courage and the spirit of self-sacrifice with which the clergy, almost to a man, proved themselves true to duty and overcame all the sufferings of persecution and all the artifices of seduction.

Our task is to consider specially the laymen and particularly those who fought for their wounded mother in the very teeth of the enemy, and hand to hand, so to speak, with the commander-in-chief of a formidable army. Such was the work of the Centre party. This work was the more important, when we consider that for years the voice of ecclesiastical authority was reduced to silence, and if heard at all, could only be at rare intervals and from the remoteness of exile. It can be said with truth, that in those times the Centre party was fulfilling a providential mission, that it had to take the place of spiritual guides of the people, to direct, to encourage and to fortify them in the struggle. These were extraordinary times, and the Catholics of Germany had need of extraor-

dinary graces and of extraordinary men. Praise be to God! Neither the graces nor the men were wanting to them. Ecclesiastical history will enroll the names of Mallinckrodt and of Windthorst with the Athanasiuses and Chrysostoms of Catholic Germany, and the whole phalanx of chosen men who marched in the train of these leaders, and will remember forever the heroic deeds and the great sacrifices of their lay-priesthood.[1]

Is it necessary to speak of the *eloquence* of the leaders of the Centre?

Eloquence is never more imposing than when it enshrines the delicate and strong emotions of the soul in great and noble thoughts. "*Pectus est, quod disertos facit!*" said Quintillian. Such is the character of the eloquence of men like Mallinckrodt, Windthorst, Reichensperger, von Schorlemer-Alst and Lieber, the leaders of the Centre. Whilst listening to them you are conscious of the chords that vibrated in a Demosthenes, a Cicero an O'Connell, a Berryer; you are conscious of the mighty voice of truth and justice; you behold that enthusiasm and that passion for good which at times exalt the speaker to sublime heights in the expression of principles, and at others, furnish him with the most impressive accents of contempt and indignation. *Vir bonus dicendi peritus!* Many orators of the Centre have illustrated in memorable speeches this definition of the orator given by the Roman of old.

But we cannot dwell on this point. We ought rather to point out the principles themselves, the inmost convictions which were the foundation of that eloquence; for it is in them that we will see the life of the Centre's strength and the secret of its success and its victories.

Here, then, is the line of conduct marked out from the beginning by the deputies of the Centre, defended faithfully and carried on without the slightest wavering and under all circumstances.

1st. *Wahrheit, freiheit und recht!* Truth, freedom and justice!

Wahrheit! We are convinced of the truth of our divine religion; God imposes upon us the duty of observing it and of keeping it intact, and no power on earth shall force us to sacrifice the least iota of it!

Freiheit! We ask for true liberty, and we will defend it as well against the despotism of power as against the abuses of license.

---

1 Mgr. Ketteler retired in 1872 from the parliamentary arena, where the episcopal word was drowned in the overflowing cynicism of triumphant insult. Being an old army officer and patriot, a Prussian patriot to the heart's core, he had always hoped that Prussia, by becoming the first power in Germany, would grant to the country real peace between Church and State. But in face of the projected May Laws he wrote to his constituents, "I am compelled, like many others, to renounce that hope, which I have cherished for a quarter of a century; *we have deceived ourselves: wir haben uns getäuscht!*"

We demand especially the most precious of all liberties: religious liberty!

Recht! The State has its rights and its independence. We will be their energetic defenders against all revolution and against every attack. But the State is not the source of the rights of its subjects; it enjoys its prerogatives only because it has the mission of assuring to all the people the free exercise of their rights.

2d. By the laws called ecclesiastical, the State arrogates to itself power which does not belong to it; it legislates in a matter beyond its sphere; it destroys the divine constitution of the Church, enters into the domain of conscience and violates our most sacred rights. We cannot then submit to such laws without renouncing our God and our religion. *Oportet Deo magis obedire quam hominibus!* But no one shall ever accuse us of exciting revolt. We reject all idea of revolution. We will therefore oppose your May Laws with a "passive resistance"; we will endure your violence, we will go to prison and to exile; we are prepared even to die for the right, but we will never oppose violence to the brute force of your gendarmes and your soldiers. Having done our duty, we shall say gladly: "*Moriamur in simplicitate nostra!*"

3d. Hence, also, the intimate union between the Centre and the *Holy See*, the source of all strength and of all unity in the Church. That union has not been loosened for a single instant, even under the most difficult and delicate circumstances. Accepting this principle, that the successor of St. Peter has alone the plenitude of spiritual power in the Church, these men of faith always victoriously answered Bismarck: "The Pope is our head in religious matters; your laws shall never depose him; you never can tear out from our hearts our attachment to the throne of St. Peter. It alone can grant to the State certain concessions in ecclesiastical affairs. Apply to Pius IX., to Leo XIII., and any measure sanctioned by them shall be faithfully carried out by us."

With this platform, the deputies placed themselves on that rock which can never be shaken, and became as invincible as the rock itself. Bismarck employed every means to draw them away from it. In order to find a pretext for suppressing the Prussian legation at the Vatican, he induced the emperor to nominate to that mission a subject of the Pope, a Prince of the Pope's household, Cardinal Hohenlohe, without even seeking the permission of Pius IX. to dispose in this fashion of the services of a man entirely dependent on the head of the Church. He speaks of it in the Chamber in order to force a declaration from the Centre. The declaration is promptly given: "It is not our business to judge of that matter; apply to the Pope; and if he accepts your proposition we will be satisfied, and will make no objection." Who does not

know how, on that occasion also, the wily plan of the Chancellor was baffled by the firmness and prudence of Pius IX!

4th. The sound Catholic principles of the Centre, and its uninterrupted attachment to the Holy See, had, as a natural consequence, an *intimate union* between the Centre and the bishops and priests of Germany. Never, we believe, in any parliament in the world, have the sacred rights of the episcopate, of the clergy, and of the religious orders, found more sincere and eloquent champions. "There is but one way to overcome the resistance of our apostolic men; it is the one the pagans used against St. Paul, you must behead them!" said Mallinckrodt, one day, in the midst of the most profound silence of the Chamber, on which his words fell like blocks of granite upon the heads of his adversaries. On another occasion, the Chancellor was imprudent enough to refer to the bishops and priests as revolutionary. Immediately, von Schorlemer-Alst, a true "chevalier sans peur ni reproche," rose to his feet, and with his penetrating voice hurled at the head of the astounded Chancellor this magnificent apostrophe: "What! our bishops submit to the severest sufferings that you inflict upon them, in order not to fail in their duty to God and to the Church, and you dare to call them rebels! And who is he who hurls this accusation against them? It is the man who, in 1866, violently overthrew the constitution of the Confederation of the German States, to which all the states, including Prussia, had sworn fidelity; it is the man who, in 1866, did not fear to ally himself with the arch-revolutionist, Garibaldi; the man who induced Klapka, and the subjects of the Austrian emperor, to revolt in Hungary and Dalmatia; the man who undermined the fidelity of the soldiers to their flag and to their emperor . . . . in a word, it is Herr von Bismarck! And that man, whose past record is defiled with such gross and contemptible deeds, dares to accuse our bishops of being revolutionists without bringing forward a single fact in proof of his assertion!" That day the Chancellor was evidently crushed to the wall; that *argumentum ad hominem* was peremptory; the Liberals themselves felt that here they heard the language of outraged honesty and just indignation.

5th. But what could the Centre party effect; what was it without the *Catholic people?* If the German people were to be guided by such leaders, these leaders had received their mission from the people, and must be encouraged and upheld at their post of honor by their constituents. This supposes that the people clung to their religion with the same confidence, the same firmness, the same spirit of self-sacrifice, the same enthusiasm, as was shown in parliament, and that the manly declarations of their representatives found a deep and grateful echo in those who had elected them.

Did that union exist? Did it exist always, and under all circumstances? Did it continue in the midst of the hottest struggles and in the face of persecution?

Facts have answered that question with an eloquence which the world well understood, and still understands, and which fills their very enemies with admiration. That reciprocity of feeling and action of the Catholics of Germany by which the representatives cherished, protected, and encouraged the people, and the people followed, honored, and venerated their representatives, forms one of the grandest chapters in the parliamentary history of all countries. The unlimited confidence of the electors in their representatives could only be equalled by the fidelity with which these corresponded to that trust.

The "May laws" were adopted. The same year, 1873, new elections took place. The Centre in the Landtag gained 38 new seats, and in the Reichstag 28.

A few months afterward a great calamity overwhelmed the Centre party. Mallinckrodt was struck down by death in the very hottest moment of the battle, May 26, 1874. Universal mourning filled the Catholic hearts of the land, such a mourning as had never before been witnessed for any man.

In all Prussia there was not a single Catholic Church or chapel where the Holy Sacrifice was not offered for the repose of the soul of this leader, so venerated and well loved; and everywhere the faithful crowded into the temples and prayed with tears in their eyes *Lux aeterna luceat ei, Domine*, for him who, a few days before his death, had finished one of his grand discourses, with the triumphant cry of the martyrs: *Per crucem ad lucem!* Our Jonathan had fallen upon the field of honor, and of him also were verified to the letter these words of Holy Scripture: "And they bewailed Jonathan exceedingly, and Israel mourned with great lamentation." (I. Mach., xiii.).

And also on those days of sorrow and mourning, the enemies rejoiced, saying, we will certainly destroy them, for "they have no prince nor any to help them." But another Simon seized the immaculate standard which had fallen from the hand of his dying brother, and seeing that the people were in dread and fear, he assembled them and exhorted them, saying: "You know what great battles I and my brother have fought for the laws and the sanctuary, and the distresses that we have seen, and now far be it from me to spare my life in any time of trouble; for I am not better than my brother. I will avenge then my nation and the sanctuary, for all the heathens are gathered to destroy us out of mere malice!" (I. Mach., xiii.) Need we name this Simon? He is the accomplished statesman, the consummate orator, the party leader with-

out equal, and besides all this, the Christian model, Herr Windthorst!

It was not only the deputies of the Centre, but all the Catholics of the empire who unanimously acclaimed him general-in-chief, "and the spirit of the people was enkindled as soon as they heard these words, and they answered with a loud voice saying: thou art our leader in the place of Jonathan thy brother; fight thou our battles and we will do whatsoever thou shalt say to us."[1]

And the new Simon was, in every regard, the worthy successor of the first; he also, as a leader prudent and foreseeing, "gathering together all the men of war, made haste to finish all the walls of Jerusalem and he fortified it round about."

And now, after nearly twenty years of desperate struggle, not only Germany but the whole world, friends and enemies, are unanimous in rendering homage to this venerable old man, and in bestowing on the grand Machabee of our days, the glorious title of the ancient: *Magnus dux et princeps populi sui!* the great captain and leader of his people! But the most beautiful recompense that a man, laboring like him for the good of his country, can find upon this earth, is the faithful attachment, the profound veneration and unalterable gratitude of a people never inconstant in all those days of dire calamity, also of most splendid victory. And this recompense, which is so much the more agreeable and so much the more consoling, because it is so rare, Divine Providence has given generously to Windthorst and to all his companions in arms. Of him and the whole Centre party might be truly said, as of the brother of Jonathan: "*Et quaesivit bona genti suae, et placuit illis potestas ejus et gloria ejus omnibus diebus.*" "And he sought the good of his nation; and his power and his glory pleased them well all his days." (I. Mach., xiv., 4).

Canossa.

Sensational utterances have always produced, and now-a-days more than ever seem to produce, wonderful effects. They electrify the masses, being the embodiment, as it were, of the leading ideas of a period, a generation of a party.

---

[1] Dr. Windthorst is, like Bennigsen, a Hanoverian, but unlike him, he never forgot his allegiance to his old king, the blind and aged George of Hanover, whose infirmities and misfortunes appealed to his sense of chivalry. On this account he was frequently reproached by Bismarck with "Particularism" and "Welfenthum," but Windthorst proved triumphantly to the princely champion of monarchy that his attachment to his former king was entirely consistent with his fidelity to the empire.

Windthorst has the title "Excellenz" as quondam Minister of Justice of King George, on which account he is called "*die kleine Excellenz.*" During almost twenty-five years the city of Meppen sent him to the Landtag and (since 1870) to the Reichstag, so that Schorlemer-Alst has invented for him the beautiful title of the "Pearl of Meppen," "*die Perle von Meppen.*"

Bismarck, with his keen knowledge of men, knew how to turn to his own advantage this weakness of human nature, which manifests itself so conspicuously in that arena of intrigues, of vanity, of political passions, which go to make up the *parliament.* Though no orator, or at most only an orator after his own fashion, his great experience, both of affairs and of men, his assurance, his boldness, even his aggressive attitude, stamped his speeches with a character of inimitable originality. He had, besides, the talent of using most happily his literary and historical reminiscences, and thereby enriching the German tongue with many "winged words" ("*geflügelte Worte.*")

The most sensational of these, as well as the most fascinating to the adversaries of the Church, the great Chancellor uttered in the Reichstag, May 14, 1872: "There is only one sovereignty, the sovereignty of the law, ... fear not, *we shall not go to Canossa, neither in body nor in spirit.*"[1]) The thunder of applause which greeted these words from the benches of Conservatives, Liberals and Progressists, re-echoed throughout the length and breadth of the land. The death-blow seemed to have been given then and there to the Centre party, to bishops and priests, and to the whole Catholic people. In the eyes of his blind admirers, Bismarck never was greater than on that 14th of May, when his admirers almost bore him in triumph, after he had spoken those "memorable, irresistible and unanswerable words."

All is over now with the Church and with the Centre party. The State will maintain its laws; never shall it yield to Rome; never to Windthorst; never will it make concessions to the Pope, nor to the bishops. We have conquered Catholicism. And why? *Ipse dixit* (the master has said so). On the pedestal of a statue, erected shortly after in honor of Prince Bismarck, these words were engraved: "We shall not go to Canossa." In the eyes of his flatterers, therefore, these words express more even than Sadowa, Metz, Sedan and Paris, the true title which their hero has to the gratitude of posterity.

This is the year 1890. Nearly twenty years separate us from the events we have chronicled in the preceding pages. Already time, *edax rerum,* has literally rent the pedestal of Bismarck's statue, and the fissure runs straight through the famous historical words. But, beyond this fact, which is the result of natural causes, do we not see a higher providential action, of which it is the appropriate symbol? *Has not history itself here also torn into shreds the haughty declaration* of the most powerful political genius of our time? In other words: Has Herr von Bismarck come out

[1] "*Seien sie ausser Sorge, nach Canossa gehen wir nicht, weder körperlich noch geistig.*"

victorious from his gigantic warfare against the Pope, the bishops and priests, and especially against the Centre party? Has he not, in his turn, also been forced to exclaim: "*Galilæe vicisti?*"

Facts are stubborn things; "*Cum tacent, clamant;* their very silence speaks eloquently to the just and impartial mind.

1st. Bismarck employed every means to destroy the *papal authority* in Germany; to detach both pastors and people from the centre of unity; witness his repeated declarations in parliament; witness the May laws; witness all the favors bestowed upon the German schismatics or heretics, to the "Staats-Katholiken" and "Alt-Katholiken."

In order to give to his warfare against the papacy an international character, on the very day of his "Canossa" declaration, he sent a dispatch to all the governments of Europe, suggesting the course to be followed, in regard to the election of the future Pope! In this document he said that "the relation of the Papacy with the governments had been *completely* altered by the definitions of the Council"; that, therefore, they all should agree "on *the conditions on which the coming election would be recognized.*" The result proved a complete diplomatic fiasco. No answer was even given by any government, yet Bismarck's measure was, in itself, calculated to give rise to endless complications in political and religious matters.

History, which relates the above facts, tells us also, with no less certainty that no one in our day has contributed more powerfully towards restoring the moral prestige of the Papacy *from an international point of view*, than Bismarck, when he asked Leo XIII. to act as arbitrator in the affairs of the Caroline islands; it tells us that no one has tendered a more striking homage to the papal authority in the Church than this same chancellor, when he solicited the intervention of the Holy Father in an affair which seemed to be exclusively of a political order, namely, *to obtain the vote of the Centre party for the "Septennate."*

The union of bishops, priests and faithful with the successor of St. Peter, has never been more intimate, more cordial, more loyal, in Germany than during the Kulturkampf.

And this has been the work of the Kulturkampf, the work of Bismarck.

2d. Has Bismarck *triumphed over Catholicism in Germany?*

Without doubt the persecution has inflicted deep wounds on the Catholic Church in Germany. For many years the regular discharge of pastoral duties was made impossible. Pastors were separated from their flock. The beneficial influence of the religious orders was destroyed. Priests were decimated and seminarians found the threshold to the sanctuary closed against them. It will

take time to heal all these wounds. Yet we ask the question: *Has Bismarck triumphed by his hostile measures?* Here again history answers clearly and emphatically, *No!* The "National Church" was a miserable failure; the handful of "Old Catholics" are struggling helplessly for existence; the government and the people are fully convinced that Dr. Reinkens is the *first* and *last* bishop of that sect, and that no more government money will be squandered for the maintenance of the apostate. "State Catholicism" is a still-born child.

And why? Because the persecution aroused and strengthened Catholic feeling among priests and faithful. A people that will follow its deposed and unjustly condemned bishops to the prison-gates and loudly proclaim under the very prison-walls its inviolable attachment to Church and bishops; a people that will love its priests the more because of their opposition to the seductive promises of the secular power, and cheerfully share its last loaf of bread with them—for hunger was one of the weapons used by the government;—a people that, deprived of its lawful pastors, will prefer to have divine services held by laymen, to have its dead buried without the priest rather than have any communion with such as had received their commission from the State; a people whose enthusiastic loyalty to their representatives in parliament increased in proportion to their manly defense of religion and liberty; a people, finally, that will not shrink from the greatest sacrifices rather than renounce its religious convictions; such a people is invincible even when contending with the most skilful diplomatists, or with the most powerful potentates; invincible by the strength of that faith which conquered the world, and through the help of Him who "abandons none of His own, and least of all, a whole nation, unless He himself be first abandoned."

3d. And now as to the position of the *Centre party*. All parties had become subservient to Bismarck's policy; Conservatives turned Liberals and Liberals became Conservatives, as he willed it; and this the more readily, as both parties had sacrificed to him all principle and joined the famous party called "Bismarck *sans phrase*." Thus he was always supported by a party, or rather by a majority, whose principle it was to have no other principle than blind obedience to the all-powerful ruler.

The Centre party alone was never conquered. They remained ever true to their principles, and therefore it was that their electors remained true to them. In vain did the chancellor struggle during twenty years to split up and dissolve the party, heaping upon it the most odious accusations, and even trying to brand its members as the accomplices of the murderer Kullmann![1] The party was not

[1] On the 13th of July, 1874, a young man fired at Prince Bismarck, in Kissingen, without, however, injuring him. Kullmann had for years completely neglected his

broken up; it did not "dissolve and evaporate," according to the complimentary expression of Minister Puttkamer. *The impregnable fortress never surrendered.*

To this day the Centre party represents, in the truest sense of the word, the Catholic people, the nobility, the clergy, and the burghers of all grades. It was with pride that this people sent back to Berlin those men of honor who had fallen from their government positions, victims to the Kulturkampf; such men as the indefatigable Mooren, the excellent Kauffmann, the Landrath Janssen, equally eminent as a government official, as a citizen and as a Catholic, who may be justly styled: "*Every inch a gentleman!*"

"You cannot make us pliable," said, one day, Herr von Schorlemer-Alst; "like steel, we become harder under the hammer! You are going to Canossa; we shall meet you there with the Catholic Church and Gregory VII.!" And truly, that steel has shown its strength. . . . . To-day the Centre party is the most numerous in the Reichstag and in the Landtag. In both Houses the Vice-President is a Catholic (Count Ballestrem in the Reichstag, Baron Huene in the Landtag); a bishop (Dr. Kopp, prince-bishop of Breslau), and a priest (the celebrated Hitze) were invited by the emperor to the international labor-congress. Fifteen years ago the members of the Centre party were stigmatized as "Reichsfeinde," as "enemies of the empire"; to day, at the death of the noble Herr von Franckenstein, the emperor sends his condolence to his mourning family and to the Reichstag for the loss of a "*great and well-deserving patriot!*"

One word more in conclusion in relation to Prince Bismarck. We have given him credit for his great qualities as well as for his great faults; for his political services and failures; we do not hesitate to render him also a tribute of homage for one of his actions, the more deserving of praise as it is but seldom found in men of his position. *Bismarck has had the courage to disavow the Kulturkampf which was mainly his work.* We do not mean to say that he has divested himself of his prejudices against the Church and the Centre party, and that by going to Canossa he passed through Damascus. We have no grounds for such a statement. Yet if, politically, perfect contrition was wanting in him, surely he had attrition, and this will answer in history, especially when followed by a public confession. If the wrong inflicted on the spouse of Christ could not move his conscience, at least as a man of ob-

---

religious duties. A Catholic baptismal certificate was found on his person, and the chancellor, shortly after, had the audacity to insult the Centre party with these words: "The murderer hangs to your coat-tails." "*Der Mörder hängt sich an Ihre Rockschösse!*" His organ, the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, then designated the Centre as the "Kullmann party."

servant and logical mind, he had to admit, like Fouché, after the execution of the Duc d, Enghien, by order of Napoleon I.:

"*C'est plus qu'un crime, c'est une faute!*"

At the sight of all the ruins he had made in waging war against peaceable citizens, at the sight of the ravages wrought by the irreligious spirit to which he had given full sway; at the sight of the monster Socialism rearing its head with incredible audacity; hearing the old Emperor William, after two horrible attempts on his life, cry out, "Man muss dem volk seine religion wiedergeben" (Give back to the people its religion)—the Chancellor and Minister showed his independence of character and true patriotism by openly acknowledging the necessity of changing his tactics and of revoking his anti-religious measures.

Already, in 1876, he commenced negotiations with Pius IX., but his proposals could not be accepted. In 1878, he explicitly solicited an interview with the Apostolic Nuncio of Bavaria, Mgr. Aloisi-Masella; in 1879 he invited the Nuncio of Vienna, Mgr. Jacobini, to a conference at Gastein, in Austria. In 1881, the Prince himself, compelled, as he said, by the "logic of facts" (Logik der Thatsachen), proposed in the Reichstag the *re-establishment of the embassy* at the Vatican, and obtained its adoption by the votes of the Conservatives and the Centre party *in spite of the violent opposition* of the Liberals and Progressists. Since then, one after the other, most of the May Laws have been either withdrawn or modified, and made far more lenient by the power of "dispensation," which the government demanded of Parliament—all in consequence of the incessant remonstrances of the Centre party.

In 1887, Bismarck laid before the Landtag a bill agreed upon *between himself and the Pope* to determine the legal status of the clergy in Prussia. On this occasion the Chancellor made the following significant declarations:

"My standpoint is altogether *a political one*. . . . . I have often before signed delarations of peace. . . . . now *rebus sic stantibus*, it is my desire *to do the same with the Pope*. . . . . Herr Beseler (a liberal) has just now told us that the *Religious Orders* are odious to the Protestants. Gentlemen, that has nothing to do with the subject. The question is,—to *re-establish peace within the state and with the whole nation* . . . . whether the Religious Orders are necessary or not *depends on the opinion of our Catholic people* . . . . In regard to the *education of the clergy*, I consider the May Laws *a failure*. . . . . Personally, *I lay no stress* on the obligation of the bishops to notify the government concerning the appointment of priests. . . . . *Internal peace is no less necessary for our political influence abroad.*"

Thus Bismarck spoke in the Herrenhaus, March 23d, 1887. Before the Abgeordneten-haus he defended the "law of peace" in the following terms (21st of April, 1887): "We must make *concessions to our Catholic fellow-citizens*, ... the *good of the state demands it*. . . . . Others may prefer to continue the struggle, ... but the government has only to ask itself, *what is beneficial for the whole state?* . . . . Gentlemen, if you had my share of responsibility you certainly would vote the law. . . . . It is time to end the fight; I say this *in view of the "salus publica,"* and in *view of the future*. . . . . If you trust me, you will unanimously adopt the law; . . . . *should it fail to pass, I will be compelled to resign for my own political honor and authority.*" In other words: Either adopt the "law of peace," or I retire from the arena of politics; either end the struggle against Catholics, or the state itself is in imminent danger!

This was the *clearest and strongest condemnation ever uttered against the Kulturkampf!* It was, at the same time, a *confession* that all the efforts of the Chancellor and of his allies against the Church had been vain and fruitless.

With justice, then, one of the greatest political historians of Germany, Dr. Jörg, wrote at that time: "*This fact is unique in parliamentary history. Any other minister would have retired into the solitude of private life, leaving to his successor the responsibility of such an altered condition of internal politics. Prince Bismarck alone could dare do what he did!*"

Three years after, and Prince Bismarck has been forced to "retire into the solitude of private life."

Peace has dawned once more upon the Church in Germany; yet all the just claims of Catholics are far from being satisfied. Will they ever be in Prussia? It is our heart's desire, for the welfare of our beloved Fatherland. Meanwhile, the Centre party will continue to be the pride and joy of the faithful Catholic people. True to their Church, and true to their sovereign, they will fight on to the end, full of hope and full of courage, for the cause of "truth, freedom, and justice," and thus remain ever:

"The impregnable fortress!"

CONSECRATION OF THE PHILADELPHIA CATHEDRAL—HISTORICAL REMINISCENCES.

THE consecration, this year, of the noble Cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul, Philadelphia, on the feast of the commemoration of St. Paul, the Apostle, whom the Church so unwaveringly associates with the chief of the apostles, fixes an epoch from which we can turn our glance into the historic past, and attempt to look into the future, though we cannot stand with the prophet Balaam on the jutting height and see God's Church below us, and the clouds of futurity lift for a moment to reveal its vicissitudes and its glories amid the constant combination of human changes.

A cathedral in Philadelphia consecrated forever to the service and adoration of Almighty God under the invocation of the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, the humble unlettered fisherman, and the disciple of Gamaliel, rich in the lore of scribe and Pharisee. The consecration consummates the work of Bishop Francis Patrick Kenrick, the man of learning and power, whom Providence raised up to deliver a diocese from schism which was striving to overwhelm Catholicity and destroy it, unless it consented to live the mere slave of infidelity and heresy.

Let us go back three-quarters of a century. The diocese of Philadelphia was without a bishop. The first who held the office had died of a broken heart, from the constant war made upon him by the trustees of his pro-cathedral, a body unknown to the canon law, men elected by those men to whom they let pews or seats in a church which they did not even own, men who had lost any remnant of faith ever implanted in their souls, avowedly strangers to the sacraments of the church, imbued with and influenced by the ideas of every sect around them, and every possible error against Catholic discipline.

The Rt. Rev. Michael Egan had been a priest of the purest and highest type in the Order of the Seraphic St. Francis. Humble, zealous and laborious as he was, his ability was as fully recognized in his Order as was his piety. This Galway priest became guardian of the famous convent of St. Isidore, in Rome, but left the honors of the Eternal City to become a working missionary in his native land. His merit and worth became known in America, and the congregation at Lancaster, with the approval of Bishop Carroll, invited him to Pennsylvania. He won the esteem of the founder of the American hierarchy and the attachment of his people. Seeing the vast field

for missionary work in this country, he solicited and obtained at Rome the necessary powers to found a province of the Franciscan Order in the United States. Before long the Catholics of Philadelphia urged Bishop Carroll to transfer him to St. Mary's Church, as a position better fitted for him than that of assistant in a country parish. Philadelphia then became the scene of his priestly functions, and it was this worthy friar of St. Francis whom Pope Pius VII., on the recommendation of Bishop Carroll, appointed first bishop of the newly-erected see of Philadelphia. Mild and gentle, full of zeal to maintain his flock in the faith, and make it known where it had been misrepresented, a career of usefulness in the episcopate, environed by the love of his people, seemed almost certain. But the Protestant spirit of trusteeism with none of its Protestant safeguards had been treacherously fastened on the Catholic organization. Bishop Egan had scarcely returned from Baltimore, with the oil of consecration yet on his brow, when the trustees of St. Mary's Church, who did not even own the ground, began a war upon him which they maintained with unrelenting bitterness till he sank under the strain. His physical constitution gave way, and when priests who were fellow-countrymen turned against him, his nervous system yielded, and he died a martyr to the rights of the Church, extended as he implored on the floor of a little room adjoining old Saint Joseph's. He expired on the 22d of July, 1814, the first member of our hierarchy to die in America.

Before the year 1815 was ushered in, Rev. Louis de Barth de Walbach, a priest of a noble family, naturally cautious, prudent and firm, was administrator of the bereaved diocese.

The year 1815 was an eventful one in the history of the Church in this country. It opened with the authorities of the diocese of Louisana calling on the faithful to rise and repel the invaders of our American soil; it saw the feebler sex gathered around the altar to implore God in His mercy to avert the destruction which seemed imminent; it saw the head of the Church there congratulate the victorious general on a victory which was rather the work of a kind Providence than the result of human strength or skill. The same year saw Georgetown College, our oldest literary institution, chartered by Congress; it beheld Maryland rejoice that Pius VII., by restoring the Society of Jesus, had given the old Catholic province the organization which had planted religion there and maintained it during all the dark and gloomy days of penal laws and bitter persecution. The eventful year saw Louisiana once more directed by a consecrated bishop, after languishing since the days of Spanish sway in anarchy and rebellion. The Catholic body, indeed, mourned before the close of 1815 the death

of the great founder of the hierarchy, the Most Rev. John Carroll, but amid their tears over his body, gathered to rest at an advanced age, they were consoled by the remembrance of how much Heaven had accomplished through his ministry in raising a scattered community of Catholics, disheartened and manacled by the old slave instinct, ground into the very fibre of their hearts by long years of oppression, into a set of men instinct with the freedom wherewith Christ had made them free in the domain of religion, and with the freedom with which civil institutions had endowed them in the noblest government the world had yet beheld.

But in Philadelphia there was gloom; tears over the bier of the good missionary and devoted bishop, who had fallen the first victim to the anti-Catholic spirit of trusteeism, a gloomy outlook for the future, the good dejected, disheartened, no project for any great work for God's glory, a sense of utter hopelessness.

It was a strange state of things to be brought about by a few factious men, in a State where in colonial days Catholicity had been comparatively free, had enjoyed liberty unknown even in Maryland, where in the number and prosperity of her children everything seemed to promise a future that would make the Church in Pennsylvania the wonder and envy of Catholics in other States.

Yes, perhaps it was this very prosperity and immunity which made Philadelphia and Pennsylvania the scene of an inevitable strife, a battle which, in the nature of things, could but come, and could but result, though not without loss of souls, in the triumph of Catholic faith, Catholic discipline and Catholic principle.

If we look back a little farther, if our glance takes in the whole century, we behold the Rev. John Carroll consecrated in a chapel dedicated to Our Lady, Bishop of Baltimore, on the feast of the Assumption, 1790. We see the contemplative daughters of Carmel arrive to raise their hands in prayer, while priests exercised the ministry, and the faithful struggled with the cares and the trials and the temptations of life. We see the sons of Olier, the company of St. Sulpice, offer their services to our protobishop and come to found St. Mary's Seminary and College in Baltimore; we see the disbanded Jesuits, still faithful to their old spirit, rear their college on the heights of Georgetown, and begin its work for education which for a century has given the Church young men trained in learning, science and a knowledge of their faith.

Yet it was in Philadelphia where the faithful had not been schooled in the lessons of adversity, but mingled more as equals with those outside the fold, that a want of attachment to the Spouse of Christ was first evinced openly and distinctly. The evil spirit of schism and rebellion was concealed beneath a national mask, but it came out into the broad light of day when the men who

were among us but not of us denied the authority of Bishop Carroll and arraigned the Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Pius VI., as having invaded their rights as American citizens in erecting the See of Baltimore. The same evil spirit sent Bishop Egan prematurely to the grave, and prepared to wage as relentless a war on the next prelate appointed by the Holy Father to the See of Philadelphia.

When the Rt. Rev. Henry Conwell arrived in the country as second bishop of the See, all was ripe. The very first Sunday that he appeared in the pro-cathedral he was insulted and ridiculed from the pulpit by an unworthy young priest who was already the tool and slave of the trustees, and destined to a wretched end. This priest had not such credentials as satisfied Bishop Conwell that he was one to be incorporated into his diocese. He declined to give him faculties for the diocese of Philadelphia. The trustees had the opportunity they desired, you "may tell it weeping, enemies of the cross of Christ."

They excluded the bishop from the Board of Trustees because he was not an American citizen; claimed the right to appoint pastors in the church, elected the insubordinate priest and gave him a seat in the board, though not a citizen and claiming to belong to a diocese in Ireland. Then they drove the bishop and his faithful priests from the pro-cathedral and inaugurated a schism that lasted for years. Their unfortunate tool endeavored in vain to escape from their thraldom; the great Bishop England, who saw fully the dangerous nature of the situation, tried to save him and tried to draw him away from Philadelphia, but these enemies of the cross of Christ held him fast and hurried him in the way of destruction. They professed great respect for the laws of the Church, and paraded extracts from an old copy of the Corpus Juris Canonici, holding up mere notes of the decisions of Popes a thousand years ago, in a different age, in different countries and under different circumstances, as a rule of iron, to which they were duly submissive and all Catholics should bow; but when the decision of the Archbishop of Baltimore was against them, the decision of bishops like Cheverus and England, for whose judgment they called, was against them; when a Pope not of the early or middle ages, but the living, ruling Pope pronounced in the very case after they had presented their claims in the strongest light, they laughed to scorn opinions of bishops and the very judgment of the Vicar of Christ.

What a life of struggle was that of the aged Bishop Conwell! He planned a cathedral where he would be free from such enemies of the cross of Christ. He called on foreign parts to aid him. Propaganda exhorted the bishops of the United States to institute collections that would enable their Right Reverend Brother of Philadelphia to erect a Cathedral where Christ should be free, but

Dr. Conwell was too far advanced in life to accomplish his projects. After fighting the good fight like a hero, he yielded weakly in a despondent moment; and then elicited from Rome a clear and distinct utterance anathematizing for all time the un-Catholic and destructive claim of those enemies of God's church, the trustees of St. Mary's.

All great works for the good of Catholicity in Pennsylvania, seminary, college, academies, schools, hospital, asylums, all these necessary institutions had been thwarted at the outset, rendered impossible by the action of these evil men who rent the seamless robe of Christ, chilled Christian charity and arrayed Catholics against each other.

Once more the diocese was in the hands of an administrator. Holy and able priests shrank back from a proffered mitre that was lined with thorns. The great diocese of Philadelphia, that should have been a picture of Christian progress, of Catholic prosperity, of holy zeal, was paralyzed. Religion lost rather than gained. The altar of St. Mary's Church was profaned by sacrilegious rites offered by priests without authority or power, priests placed there by men who utterly despised the discipline of the Church and the laws of morality. Fortunately, men of that class have gone from among us; the men who then assailed the Church from within, have gone to their account, some by sudden and unprovided death. Their children and their children's children educated without Catholic principles, are rarely to be found in the household of the faith. This great trial was the unhappy lot of Philadelphia. She endured the suffering and by the example of her trials and tribulations, became a salutary warning to every diocese in the land.

God, in His Providence, sent at last a man to rally the host of the Lord; the sword of the Lord and of Gedeon was uplifted; the timid and faint of heart were dismissed, and before the faithful few the walls of their strong city crumbled. The Right Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick came as a man of power. The student, the professor, had done much active missionary work under the saintly Flaget. In the lists of controversy under the humble title of Omicron, he had discomfited the boastful enemy of the faith. A man of learning, of experience, of inward power and strength and firmness, he came to raise the diocese from the dust, and quicken it with life. He seemed to act out the words of the Apocalypse: "And to the Angel of the Church of Philadelphia, write: These things saith the Holy One, the True One, He that hath the Key of David. . . . . Behold, I will bring of the synagogue of Satan, who say they are Jews and are not, but do lie; Behold, I will make them to come and adore before thy feet; and

they shall know that I have loved thee." The trustees, these men who said they were Catholics, and were not, but did lie, attempted to resist him. He struck them down by a single blow; they rose staggering and confused and attempted to continue their resistance; a heavier blow laid them helpless at his feet. The whole diocese of Philadelphia was not to be paralyzed by a few "who say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie." A church of St. John, free from its corner stone to roof from all taint of heretical trusteeism after he had established legitimate authority, became his pro-cathedral. And in his vigorous action, the priest who reared St. John's, Rev. John Hughes, learned the lesson he was to practise in another field when the mitre was placed on his brow, and he, too, had to cope with the evil that sought to fetter, to cripple and to poison the Church of God.

Selected for his work by the advice of the bishops assembled in the first Council of Baltimore, Bishop Kenrick came to the city long rent by dissensions, long injured by scandals, long enervated by lukewarmness. Under his impulse new churches sprang up, able priests extended missions and prepared for additional houses of worship. Academies for young men opened in Philadelphia, the *Dames de la Retraite* founded an academy there for young ladies, as the Poor Clares soon did at Pittsburgh; the Sisters of Charity multiplied their schools and opened an academy at Wilmington, and in 1834 the diocese could boast of a theological seminary under the care of the learned administrator himself. It grew and developed, and was soon dedicated to the great bishop and trainer of priests, St. Charles Borromeo. The present venerable Dean of the Hierarchy, Most Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick, was its president in 1838, when its incorporation by the State gave it a permanent existence. Soon after, the president's chair was filled by another great and noble man, Rev. Michael O'Connor, the greatest Patristic theologian of our Church, destined in time to wear the mitre of Pittsburgh, to labor there for God's glory till the busy brain was worked beyond its natural strength, and he retired to the Society of Jesus, which he had long desired to enter. With what feelings of reverence have we knelt by his grave, and now the grave has closed over his brother, who, after guiding also the seminarians at St. Charles's Seminary, became bishop in Nebraska.

"There were giants in those days," and among these must be classed Rt. Rev. Michael O'Connor. Years of experience in the Diocese of Philadelphia had made him aware of the condition of Catholicity in Western Pennsylvania. In 1841 he was sent to Pittsburgh as Vicar General to restore peace and harmony. On the spot, able to look around him and study the actual situation of affairs, Dr. O'Connor saw what the necessities, the imperative

needs of the faithful were, and how much an earnest, devoted Bishop stationed there might accomplish. Of himself he never thought, and his appointment in 1843 came upon him like a sudden clap of thunder. His whole mind, his whole heart was absorbed with the one idea of entering the Society of Jesus. He hastened to Rome, and kneeling at the feet of Gregory XVI., whom he knew so well, he begged permission to enter the Order founded by Saint Ignatius. But the Sovereign Pontiff looked at the work to be done in America. He saw before him the learned, able priest best fitted to accomplish it, and appointed him Bishop of the Diocese of Pittsburgh. Consecrated by Cardinal Fransoni in Rome, he returned to Pittsburgh with a heavy burthen of care. What work was before him! Churches were needed in many places: some of these were soon in progress. Academies, under Sisters of Mercy, schools, asylums, Sunday-Schools, a Catholic newspaper, soon showed that a new centre of Catholic life and energy existed in Pittsburgh. Then came a theological seminary, of which no one better than Bishop O'Connor knew the importance. Every year showed its increase of churches, priests and institutions. The Bishop's eye took in all coming growth, and at great sacrifice he secured lands which rose rapidly in value and aided him in his good work. In less than ten years Pittsburgh diocese had so grown that the interests of Catholicity called for its division. Bishop O'Connor was one who sought labor, and never shrank from it. The Diocese of Erie was erected: here much was to be done, and Bishop O'Connor, leaving Pittsburgh already well on the road of religious progress, prepared to turn all his energies to build up the new diocese. His people could not consent to the change. Yielding to the voice of the clergy and people, and the expostulations of the bishop appointed to succeed him, the Pope restored Bishop O'Connor to Pittsburgh. How his days were given to active work in his diocese, and to study, is written on the pages of the history of the Church in this country. Softening of the brain, long threatened, at last developed. He became a constant sufferer from excruciating headaches. His days as an active bishop he felt had passed, and leaving his brother, Rev. James O'Connor, as administrator, he again sought Rome, to lay down his great burthen and obtain leave to enter the Society of Jesus.

His retirement caused general grief. Priests and people alike felt how great was their loss. Student and man of learning, he was yet eminently practical; naturally a recluse, he seemed to know and understand all men. He had the great secret of impelling men to act from high and noble motives, inspiring men easily to imitate what they saw in his energetic, self-denying life.

Under the impulse of such men as Bishop Kenrick and Dr. Michael O'Connor, religion assumed another aspect. Catholicity was no longer the faith of a small, weak, divided body, whose dissensions excited pity or contempt. It became to the eye of bigotry a mighty power, which falsehood pictured to the deluded as a menace to the well-being of the country, as though harmony and piety and self-devotion, and industry, and obedience to the laws were not the very elements to build up a commonwealth and render it not only fair to the gaze but strong to its very heart's core. The terrible days of 1844 came, and a city, named after brotherly love, beheld churches of the living God profaned and given to the flames, the home of Sisters who had rushed to the bedside of pestilence, reduced to ashes, the streets red with the blood of Catholics. "God seeth," even in the midst of such profanation and murder and oppression, "God seeth" the triumph of His Church. The diocese of Philadelphia had sustained persecution from within, persecution from false brethren; it had now undergone a terrible persecution from without, when men thought it a service to God to butcher her faithful children; she was meriting the promised beatitude—"Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and speak all that is evil against you, untruly, for my sake."

Under this blessing, came St. Thomas of Villanova's College, where the sons of St. Augustine, though hampered by the destruction by the rioters of their church and the rich stores of learning accumulated in their library, founded a seat of education which has grown vigorous with the lapse of years. St. Joseph's College was commenced; the Ladies of the Sacred Heart founded the academy which has so long been conducted at Eden Hall, giving to Christian homes ladies of the most perfect training and well-informed piety. The Visitation Nuns entered the same field, while the Sisters of St. Joseph and Sisters of Our Lady aided the pioneer Sisters of Charity in the management of parochial schools. Then came Sisters of the Good Shepherd to labor in their peculiar field, and win back to Christ and religion those whom the allurements of the world made very lepers in the land.

Almost coeval with the terrible riots, came the division of the great diocese which, by mountain path and devious ways, Bishop Kenrick had so laboriously visited in discharge of his episcopal duties. The see of Pittsburgh was created, and the great priest, Michael O'Connor, who knelt at the feet of the Pope to ask leave to enter the Society of Jesus, was commanded to rise and assume the episcopal dignity before indulging this wish of his pious heart. The diocese of Philadelphia lost half its territory; it lost a great priest; but the Church gained by the accession to its hierarchy of one of the most remarkable members, thoroughly learned, eloquent, far-seeing, judicious, calm, broad, generous, sympathetic.

With the diocese reduced in size, well equipped with a diocesan seminary, educational and charitable institutions, with priests, many of whom had been carefully trained under his own eye, and priests and people animated by a holy love of religion, Bishop Kenrick felt that he might commence a work to add dignity to religion, and endow Philadelphia with a cathedral worthy of the prosperity which God had given it, and the glorious hopes entertained by the faithful. Then, on Sunday, September 6th, 1846, Bishop Kenrick, with the clergy of the city and the ecclesiastical students of the diocese, moved in procession from the Seminary of St. CharlesBorromeo to the site opposite Logan Square, and there, in the presence of a vast multitude, numbering fully ten thousand, the corner-stone was laid with all the ceremonies prescribed by the Church. In a pastoral letter he called upon the faithful of the diocese to aid in erecting the proposed Cathedral, the church not of a parish or a city, but of the whole bishopric; but other calls were more urgent. St. Michael's and St. Augustine's were to be rebuilt; the Catholics in Spring Garden to be provided for. A widows' home, a hospital were greatly needed. The cry of famine-stricken Ireland appealed to all hearts with an eloquence and pathos that brought generous response. In view of all these calls on the charity and piety of the faithful, the hand of the Bishop was stayed. In 1849 he addressed to his flock a pastoral, in which he proposed to complete, at first, only the sanctuary and transept within two years, leaving the carrying out of the original design to be postponed, or executed gradually, as circumstances might warrant. But before even this restricted plan could be carried out Bishop Kenrick became Metropolitan.

The Sovereign Pontiff, sensible of the worth of the author of the "Theologia Dogmatica," "Theologia Moralis," "The Primacy of the Apostolic See," the revision of Martin and Challoner's Douay Bible, promoted him to the Archiepiscopal See of Baltimore. It was one characteristic of Bishop Kenrick that he did not attempt to do all himself. He directed, encouraged, stimulated; his priests and people learned to know that the good work would receive all the aid of his influence, and the great end was accomplished, while only the few saw how great a part he had in its inception and its success.

As his successor in the See of Philadelphia he had recommended the Redemptorist Father, John Nepomucene Neumann, originally a secular priest in the diocese of New York, but who had enrolled his name among the sons of St. Alphonsus Liguori. Great but unostentatious learning, piety, zeal, prudence, characterized the great Religious whom Bishop Kenrick knew and revered. When his name was proposed at a meeting of the bishops, Rt. Rev. Michael O'Connor, who knew Philadelphia and its wants

so well, and who knew Father Neumann, said: "Philadelphia must have a bishop that can build the Cathedral; since the Redemptorist Father Neumann knows how to erect fine churches with small means, I give him my vote." It was, indeed, from the outset a dominant thought in the mind of Bishop Neumann, who might well say, with the royal prophet: "The beauty of Thy house have I loved and the dwelling place of Thy glory." In his first pastoral he reminded the faithful of their obligation to join in carrying out the great work, and in May, 1852, he issued a circular calling a public meeting to take practical steps for its completion. He would incur no debt. As means came, the work went on. On one occasion, he said: "The circumstance of its progressing slowly ought not to discourage any one, nor should any one be tempted to doubt of its ever being finished. The old saying holds good here: 'What is to last long must be built slowly.' Our principal object in moving thus slowly is that the faithful may not be taxed too heavily, since every parish has its own institutions to support." Slowly and surely, under the guidance of this saintly man, the great structure rose. By 1858 the walls were up, and the faithful could begin to comprehend the size and majesty of the Cathedral which they had reared for the honor of Almighty God. There it stood, one hundred and thirty-two feet wide, two hundred and seventeen feet long, vast, imposing, solid. On the 13th of September, in the following year, a little more than thirteen years after the laying of the corner-stone, the keystone of the dome was set, and the cross placed in position more than two hundred feet high in air. Right Rev. James Frederic Wood, coadjutor to Bishop Neumann, performed the ceremony of blessing it, while the crowd who filled the grand interior listened in rapt attention to the eloquent words of Bishop Spaulding of Louisville.

Bishop Neumann raised his heart in gratitude to God for permitting the work to be so far accomplished, but he was not led away from his cautious policy by a desire to complete the interior of the Cathedral. His life was not long, indeed, to be spared to the city and diocese which he had edified. Bishop Neumann expired on Vine Street. His life had been that of a saint. Death did not find him unprepared or unprovided. The cause of his Beatification has actually been introduced in the Congregation of Rites at Rome, and the Episcopal Process into his life and virtues, which lasted two years, has been taken under the authority of Archbishop Ryan, and has been approved by the sacred Congregation, so that the Pontifical Process will soon follow. Slow as such investigations are, some now living may witness in the Cathedral, which he did so much to rear, the celebration of the Beatification of Blessed John Nepomucene Neumann, and his portrait exposed within its walls for the veneration of the faithful.

The successor of this saintly man, Most Rev. James Frederic Wood, became the first Archbishop of Philadelphia. Though war desolated the land, he bent all his energies to complete the interior, and he had the consolation to dedicate it with all solemnity on the 20th of November, 1864. A fine medal, the most exquisite piece of numismatic skill struck in connection with the Catholic Church in the United States, was issued by Archbishop Wood, a fitting memento of the work of so many pious desires, of such anxious thought and persistent effort. Around it cling the memories of the great Archbishop Francis Patrick Kenrick, of Bishop Michael O'Connor, the saintly Neumann, the energetic Archbishop Wood.

Now in the centennial year of the consecration of Baltimore's first bishop and archbishop the great cathedral of Philadelphia is to be consecrated with all the rites and ceremonies prescribed by the time-honored pontifical of holy mother Church. It is a grand event to commemorate a century of growth.

Eloquent pens have depicted the condition of the church a hundred years ago as contrasted with its present state of promise, but let us look back for half a century. The Redemptorist Fathers had just secured a footing in Pennsylvania by founding a house at Pittsburgh; the Sovereign Pontiff had erected the two Californias into a diocese, and thus unconsciously prepared for the thriving dioceses and institutions in the upper province. For the fourth time the Fathers of the ecclesiastical province of Baltimore had gathered around their metropolitan in the venerable cathedral of Baltimore; diocesan synods were held in Baltimore and Cincinnati, soon followed by similar venerable assemblies in New York and Philadelphia. There was activity in the church and yet the numbers of the faithful and their resources were so scanty! There were but 501 priests in the land; churches, even adding in chapels, numbered only 454. All New England was one diocese; Maine that now has a bishop and a numerous body of clergy had six priests, attending nine churches, three but just erected. New Hampshire, now a separate diocese, had two churches and as many priests. Vermont had one church, and gazed sadly at the smoking ruins of St. Mary's, Burlington, fired by an incendiary. Connecticut and Rhode Island each had two priests; the former two, the latter three, churches. Massachusetts had fourteen churches, the ruins of an Ursuline convent, the nucleus of a college, a house of Sisters of Charity and fourteen priests. The diocese of New York, then embracing the state of New York and half of New Jersey, but now divided into no fewer than seven bishoprics, had but sixty-three priests. Philadelphia, since grown into seven dioceses, had fifty-one priests, seventy-eight churches and chapels. Ohio, now constituting three dioceses, had twenty-four churches and thirty-

five priests. Indiana, now forming two prosperous dioceses, had twenty-seven churches and twenty priests. Illinois had not even a single bishop as yet, had twenty-five priests and twenty-seven churches. Arkansas had one church and two priests. Michigan had twelve priests. Wisconsin had four priests, where there are now an archbishop's and two bishops' sees, each with a numerous clergy. Iowa, with a see at Dubuque, had a bishop whose clergy consisted of two priests. Tennessee had one bishop, one priest and one church; Mississippi one church and one priest. The diocese of Mobile, with thirteen priests and seven churches, seemed far in advance, and Charleston, with a diocese embracing three states, had under the great Bishop England risen to fourteen churches and nineteen priests. The episcopate had just lost the great Simon Gabriel Bruté, Bishop of Vincennes. Most Rev. Samuel Eccleston was Archbishop of Baltimore, Bishop Fenwick was in Boston, Bishops DuBois and Hughes in New York, Bishops Conwell and Kenrick in Philadelphia, England in Charleston, Portier in Mobile. The venerable Bishop Flaget, last survivor of the suffragans of Archbishop Carroll, was still at Bardstown with Bishops Chabrat and David, Bishop Purcell was at Cincinnati, de la Hailandière at Vincennes, Miles at Nashville. Detroit and Natchez were vacant. Beyond the Mississippi Bishop Blanc presided at New Orleans and Bishop Rosati at St. Louis. They are all cherished names, yet how few they were and how hard the struggle. These were they who "in their life propped up the house and in their days fortified the temple."

If the half century has given us such wonderful increase, let us be thankful in holy fear and keep each feast of dedication and consecration in the spirit of the valiant Machabees, "with canticles and harps and lutes and cymbals. And all the people fell upon their faces, and adored and blessed up to heaven Him that had prospered them."

It falls now to the eloquent, vigilant and beloved Archbishop of Philadelphia, Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, to complete the work on which all in the long line of his predecessors took part in hope or deed. It will be his privilege to consecrate it absolutely and irrevocably to God's service by the most solemn rite in the pontifical of the Church, and make the day one to be commemorated year by year, as the Feast of the Dedication of the Temple by the Machabees was kept by the people of God till it perished, and is still kept by their scattered descendants throughout the world. A bull by the Sovereign Pontiff canonically erecting the edifice into the Cathedral Church of St. Peter and St. Paul will crown the work of years, and set its seal on the consecration by his Grace, Archbishop Ryan.

CATHOLIC DOGMA AND SCIENTIFIC DOGMATISM.

IT is now about five-and-twenty years since the attention of the world was specially directed to the theory of man's natural origin by the process of organic evolution. Since then all kinds of surmises and speculations, with a certain class whose principles are naturally opposed to those of the Church, have passed current as science, and have been pointed to as indisputable evidence of the advance of modern thought. Because the Church has not endorsed the opinions that have so universally obtained outside her pale, she has been decried as the enemy of progress and enlightenment. Because her children have scrupulously eschewed all theories that conflicted with the teachings of their faith, they have been stigmatized as inimical to science, and accused of retarding its advancement. In a word, it has been proclaimed that the Church has now, and always has had, a baneful influence on science, and on those who would devote themselves to scientific research, and that, consequently, science and her votaries have nothing of good to expect from the Church, or from those who acknowledge adhesion to her authority, and who subscribe unreservedly to her doctrines.

The subject-matter, then, of these charges—the influence of the Church on the progress of science—will bear more than a cursory examination. And in order that the results of this influence may be brought out in a brighter light—an influence that bears to the doctrines of the Church almost the same relation that effect does to cause—we shall contrast it with the influences that are non-Catholic and anti-Catholic.

That there may be no misunderstanding about the use of terms employed during the course of this article, it may at once be premised that, unless otherwise specified, the general term "science" will be used to designate what are ordinarily known as the natural and physical sciences—those sciences, namely, that are based on observation and experiment, and whose various data are co-ordinated by induction.

We shall, in the first place, briefly define the relation between religion and experimental science, and then refer, in a few words, to the dependence of the various empirical sciences on philosophy —the science of principles. After this we shall inquire who are popularly reckoned as the chief representatives and exponents of what is known as modern science. We shall next give a brief account of what these alleged masters of science are supposed to

have accomplished, and what contributions they are reputed to have made to the general stock of human knowledge. We shall then compare the conclusions of various investigators of recognized authority, and ask our readers, on the evidence presented, to form their own opinions of what we are constantly called upon to accept as science in its latest and most advanced phase.

In contemplating the relation between religion and science, between dogma and the results arrived at by experiment and induction, the first thing that must arrest one's attention is the responsibility that rests on any body or organization that claims authority to teach in matters of religion. When an individual or an organization claims to have received a divine commission to teach and preach, there is immediately and necessarily associated with such a commission an idea of infallibility that cannot be separated from the commission any more than it can be separated from truth itself.

For this reason all religious bodies, as well as their founders, are responsible, not only for the errors they teach directly, but also for those which they teach by implication. For this reason, too, they are accountable for errors in matters of science and philosophy when such errors are logically derived from doctrines that are considered as a part of the creed proclaimed or of the faith professed. And yet more. In addition to the errors that they directly or indirectly teach as organized bodies, they are likewise amenable for the errors of individuals affiliated to them, whenever such errors are the logical outgrowth from principles generally maintained, or from tenets accepted by the bodies in question as fundamental. The truth of this view is so plain that it cannot be gainsaid. It is based on simple common sense, and no one endowed with ordinary reasoning capacity would have the hardihood to contradict it any more than he would call in question a self-evident truth of philosophy or mathematics.

Of all the religious organizations, however, that ask us to give our assent to their teachings, there is only one that is equal to such a responsibility; only one that can meet such exacting requirements as those just enumerated, and that body is the Catholic Church. It alone, of all religious denominations, has taught, and it alone can teach the truths of faith without, in any way, or in any instance, contradicting the certain declarations of science, and without, in the slightest degree, impeding its development. It alone, in virtue of the truths embodied in its doctrines, aids and fosters science, and, by reason of the light which it sheds, prevents the student of science from going astray, when, if deprived of such light, a lapse into the most pernicious errors would often be almost, if not quite, inevitable.

The Church, it is true, has no mission to teach science. Her mission is to save souls. Neither has she any "call to watch over and protect science." Nevertheless, owing to the intimate connection between revelation and nature, the truths of theology cannot be entirely separated from those of science, without great detriment to the latter. For this reason Cardinal Newman justly observes "a university cannot exist externally to the Catholic pale, for it cannot teach universal knowledge if it does not teach Catholic theology."[1] For the same reason he declares that "to withdraw theology from the public schools is to impair the completeness and invalidate the trustworthiness of all that is actually taught in them." For a similar reason, also, he asserts "that revealed truth enters to a very great extent into the province of science, philosophy and literature, and that to put it on one side in compliment to secular science is simply under color of a compliment to do science a great damage." Scientists, then, require the guidance of other truths than those deduced from observation and experiment. They must have recourse to another and nigher order of knowledge—to Revelation—to be able to draw just conclusions even in their own special spheres of research. Without the light of Revealed Truth "they say what is true *exceptis excipiendis;* what is true, but what requires guarding; true, but must not be ridden too hard or made what is called a *hobby;* true, but not the measure of all things; true, but if thus inordinately, extravagantly, ruinously carried out, in spite of other sciences, in spite of theology, sure to become but a great bubble and burst."[2]

It is important to bear these facts in mind, when we consider the weight of responsibility resting on the various religious sects scattered throughout the world, for the errors of their individual members. The fact that a member of any sect, in following out to its logical consequences any principle or doctrine, may go farther than do the authors or recognized leaders of such sect, does not remove the responsibility from the sect to the individual. The individual is logical, consistent; the sect and its authors and promoters are not; and these latter, therefore, must bear the responsibility of all the errors evolved from the doctrines taught, when such doctrines come within the scope of the creed professed.

Thus Mohammedanism is answerable for the errors of those who accept its teachings, in so far as such errors proceed from or are the natural outgrowth of Mohammedan doctrines or principles. The Koran, for instance, distinctly proclaims the Ptolemaic theory of the universe, and to this theory every good Mussulman is committed. The Hindoo religion also teaches a false system of astronomy, and

---

[1] *Idea of a University.* [2] *Op. cit.*, p. 94.

likewise false systems of anatomy and physiology. These systems every devout Hindoo must accept as so many articles of faith, inasmuch as his faith is so interwoven with false, scientific systems that it is inseparable from them. Swedenborgianism labors under the same difficulty. The revelations of its founder—aside from objections that may be urged against them on other grounds—are discredited by his erroneous statements regarding the planets and solar system.

In the instances just quoted we have spoken of religious organizations and their founders as directly and explicitly teaching what is demonstrably false in science. But there are other and more numerous and more serious cases, wherein scientific errors are engendered and fostered indirectly. It may be on account of adopting some false principle of philosophy or theology, and making it the basis of a system of belief. The extent of the application of the principle asserted may not be perceived by the originator of the system, but, when it is carried by others to its logical consequences, it is found to be fraught with disaster and ruin.

Luther's principle of private interpretation of the Bible is a case in point. Its logical sequence is rationalism and infidelity; and rationalism and infidelity have given birth not only to the materialism, pantheism, agnosticism, and atheism, which prevail to such an alarming extent in our day, but also to all those false and absurd theories in philosophy and science that have been so rife during the last three and a half centuries.

Luther's principle, however, is only one among many that have equally impeded the progress of true science. The rejection of authority, the denial of the existence and necessity of revelation, the assertion of the sufficiency of human reason for the discussion and solution of all problems in philosophy seem, at first sight, to have little connection with the progress of natural and physical science; and yet, as Cardinal Newman has demonstrated in the masterly work above quoted, nothing could be more prejudicial to them or oppose greater barriers against their development.

Examine now the principles of the various bodies that are opposed to the Catholic Church; consider the doctrines of the different denominations that have protested against her authority, and rejected her teaching and discarded her philosophy, no less than her theology, and we shall see how wide-reaching is the blighting influence already alluded to, and how much of the error in every department of knowledge these same organizations can be indicted for, and that, too, by reason of the principles they maintain and the doctrines they inculcate.

One of the great glories of the Church is the introduction, by

her children, of the experimental or inductive method into the study of natural and physical science. It was by studying nature in accordance with the principles of induction that the great Catholic scientists, from Galileo and Pascal to our own time, have been so successful in their investigations, and have been able to do so much genuine work in all the branches of science. But, while recognizing the value of the inductive philosophy as an aid to the study of nature, and to co-ordinating the countless facts and phenomena which came before them, these illustrious sons of Holy Church knew well the extent of its availibility as an instrument of research. They were ever conscious that the sphere of its application was circumscribed, and was limited to the discussion of facts and phenomena fully observed and classified, and to conclusions legitimately drawn from such facts and phenomena. They recognized all along the existence of higher and more trustworthy guides—a Christian metaphysics and a divine revelation—to which their inductive philosophy was always made subservient. Over and above their knowledge of facts and their inductions therefrom, they ever retained a science of principles which, corroborated and supplemented by the truths of revelation, prevented them from falling into error.

But see how different it is with those who ignore the principles of metaphysics, and who reject the teachings of revelation. Instead of taking the inductive method for what it really is—one of the branches of philosophy to be confined within the domain of the empirical sciences—they employ it to the exclusion of all other aids and methods. In a word, they deny revelation, and relegate philosophy as a science of principles to the unknown and unknowable. This is what has been done, and what is being done, by a constantly increasing number of men who call themselves scientists, and "advanced thinkers."

Take Herbert Spencer, for instance. He is looked upon as one of the leading philosophers of the day, and has a large following of enthusiastic admirers. But his "New Philosophy," in spite of all representations to the contrary, teaches, either directly or by implication, the rankest materialism, and the most downright atheism. He, however, is simply carrying out the infidel and rationalistic principles of the reformers of the sixteenth century; and, as such, may justly be regarded as a scientific exponent of their principles, and as an advanced disciple of their irreligious teachings. The same may be said of many of his contemporaries, who are regarded as occupying a front rank among modern scientists.

Tyndall, Huxley, Darwin, Hæckel, Vogt, Büchner, Mohlschcott, Paul Bert, and others of that ilk, belong to the same school, as

their principles—if principles they can be said to have—are essentially the same. Denying the knowability of God, cause, creation, being, substance, they have left only phenomena, and rejecting revelation and philosophy, as a science of principles, there remains to them only the experimental or inductive method of arriving at truth. They sin, by adopting as the only source of knowledge a method that was employed by Catholic scientists in the study of the physical sciences only, and then as auxiliary always to a higher philosophy. They abuse a system which is good, indeed, in its proper sphere, but which is worthless outside of that sphere, or when taken as a substitute for metaphysics.

Others there are, who still give metaphysics a place in their sciences, but who fail to distinguish properly between the functions of metaphysical principles and the office of simple induction. They confound the former with the latter, and give to induction powers it does not and cannot possess. They do not, it is true, like those of whom we have just been speaking, use it as the sole method of philosophy, but give it a prominence which it cannot hold, and for which it was never intended. One class sins by exclusiveness—by accepting only the empirical method—rejecting metaphysics entirely; the other by giving it an exaggerated importance, and allowing philosophy, as a science of principles, only a secondary place, when by its very nature it should occupy the first.

But what, it may be asked, have false principles of philosophy or theology to do with the advance of experimental science? How can the religious systems of the reformers of the sixteenth century be construed to be an obstacle, direct or indirect, to progress in geology, zoology, astronomy, or any other of the natural sciences? We need not go far for an answer. They impede the proper development of science and retard its progress by giving us false views of nature, and by preventing us from looking upon nature in its entirety, and as related to God its Author. These false systems throw men into the habit of speculating and of evolving theories, and imagining them to be so much positive knowledge. They lead men to take hypothesis for demonstration, to accept opinions and guesses of individuals for genuine science. In a word, they make the followers of these systems spend their time in weaving from the webs of their inner consciousness idle fancies, instead of contributing by genuine work to the advance of practical science and true philosophy.

Let us illustrate. Among the modern scientists who are best known, and who have been most applauded, are Tyndall, Huxley, the late Charles Darwin, and Ernst Hæckel, "the Darwin of Germany." But who are these men, and on what does their reputation rest? Popular scientific speculators, known solely by their

extravagant and materialistic theories. "Advanced thinkers," forsooth, who have gained an ephemeral notoriety by dressing up in modern scientific terminology the oft-rehashed theories of Leucippus, Heraclitus, and Epicurus. Separate their theories from their contributions to real science and what is left? What have they done for the advance of science to gain the gratitude of their fellows? Let us see.

Tyndall was, for many years, lecturer on "Natural Philosophy," in the Royal Institution of Great Britain, and was, in this capacity, the successor of the illustrious Faraday, and the great Sir Humphry Davy. But what a pigmy, by the side of these eminent students of nature! Tyndall has been a popular lecturer, it is true, and a clever experimenter, and, with many, a fascinating theorizer, but we do not think one can say more of him. He has done some little original work in physics, in lines pointed out by others, but there is nothing in the intellectual make-up of the man to entitle him to be considered a deep thinker, and nothing has he done by invention or discovery in the realm of nature, to justify one in putting him above a second-rate or third-rate scientist. One can find dozens among his contemporaries, who, although less known to the general public, stand head and shoulders above him, in his special branches of research. As a physicist, and as a mathematician, the late Professor Clark Maxwell was a giant, compared with Tyndall; and yet the notoriety of the latter, with those who know no better, is considered as proof of his intellectual superiority over the former. What has been said of Maxwell, can with equal truth be said of the eminent physicists, Sir William Thompson, P.G. Tait, Gabriel Stokes, Sir G. B. Airy, late Astronomer Royal, and many others of his countrymen, who, although less known to the public than Tyndall, are considered by those who are cognizant of their relative abilities, and of what they have, severally, done for science, as deserving to be classed with a different caste.

Professor Tyndall has published some interesting lectures and notes of lectures on "Sound," "Heat," "Light" and "Electricity," and some original memoirs on the same subjects, the latter of which are known only to a limited number of specialists in science; but we venture to assert that he owes more of his celebrity —if we should not rather call it notoriety—to some of his speculative discourses than to all his other writings taken together. Prominent among such discourses, we would mention two: that on "The Scientific Use of the Imagination," and his address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at Belfast. In the latter, particularly, he tries, like many of his coworkers, to apply the experimental method—the only one with which he has any acquaintance—to the discussion of the pro-

foundest questions of philosophy and religion, to both of which, by the way, he is an utter stranger. Here he lays aside the mask which had before so illy concealed the irreligious tendencies of his teachings, and boldly proclaims the baldest materialism, declaring that he sees in matter "the promise and potency of all terrestrial life."

Huxley is celebrated in Europe and in this country, as one of the foremost representatives of modern thought. He has held, in various institutions in Great Britain, the position of professor of biology and comparative anatomy, and has, when confining himself within his proper sphere and to methods with which he is familiar, done much for which he deserves well of science. As a skilful investigator in some departments of natural science, he has won for himself an enviable position among contemporary scientists. But how many know Huxley for the real, practical work which he has accomplished? How many have ever heard of his actual contributions to science? How many, even among those who talk so much about his views, can give even a partial list of the facts and phenomena to which he first directed attention? Not one in a thousand; not one in ten thousand. They know that he is an exponent of evolution, and that, for some reason or other, he ranks high among modern agnostics, and that he maintains that animals are only conscious automata. They may know, too, that he holds that protoplasm is the physical basis of life, and that he finds an argument for evolution in the bones of the fore-legs of the horse, as studied in the light of certain fossils recently discovered in our western prairies; but, as a rule, their knowledge respecting him and his teachings, goes no further. Like Tyndall, Huxley is celebrated as a popular lecturer, and as the author of several volumes of addresses, lectures and reviews, in which he makes known his views on nature, matter, force, life, and which, like Tyndall's views, imply, if they do not always express, the most pronounced forms of materialism and pantheism.

What has been said of Tyndall and Huxley, can, in a great measure, be repeated, respecting the late Charles Darwin. As a close, patient, intelligent observer of facts and phenomena in the animal and vegetable world, he has had few if any superiors. No one who reads his works, can help admiring the ingenuity and the fertility of resource which he displays in his investigations, and the various devices which he makes use of, in attaining to a knowledge of the laws and processes of nature, as displayed in the animal and vegetable worlds. But here his merit ends. The conclusions he draws from the facts he has so diligently studied, the theories he bases on them, would be discreditable to the veriest tyro in logic. And what impresses one painfully in reading the

works of Darwin, and of those belonging to his school, is the thought, I should say, fact, that he is all along directing all his energies, not so much to increase our knowledge of nature as to establish and corroborate a pet theory. All his observations and experiments are made with that end in view, and they are marshalled together, often irrespective of their real bearing on the theory in question. Facts are presented, assumptions made and conclusions drawn, with a recklessness and a disregard of the simplest rules of dialectics, that are simply amazing. Did one not know how often "the wish is father to the thought," and to what an extent a passionate adherence to preconceived notions can render one oblivious to the simplest principles of reasoning, and contradictory of self, one would find the feebleness of his attempts at argumentation simply unexplainable. In the case of Darwin, however, these glaring defects of logic and his striking lack of consistency are frequently passed over, by the average reader, unnoticed. The interest excited by the facts presented by the author, the charm of his style and the fascinating manner in which he groups together the facts and phenomena of which he treats, captivate the mind to such an extent, that one loses sight of the connection between the premises laid down, and the conclusions drawn therefrom.

And even in his speculations, what has Darwin done but revamp, in such a way as to embrace a larger number of facts and phenomena, a theory that has been maintained, under one form or another, ever since the time of the earliest philosophers of ancient Greece? Darwin's theory of development, or evolution by "natural selection," and "the survival of the fittest," is only a modern way of putting the hypotheses of Anaximander, Empedocles, Heraclitus, Anaxagoras, Democritus, Aristotle, Epicurus and Lucretius among the ancients, and those of Kant, Oken, Lamarck and others among the moderns. The author of "The Descent of Man" and "The Origin of Species," far from originality, has not even the merit of novelty. He simply brings together and collates the observations of others, and, adding them to his own, gives forth to a sensational-loving world an old theory decked out in a garment of many colors, and cut according to the requirements of the prevailing fashion of that capricious *modiste* ycleped "Modern Science."

And this is what Darwin has contributed to the general treasury of natural knowledge. He wrote many books and spent a long life in the fruitless work of presenting in a new form an old speculation, and one which, by its very nature, can never be raised above a speculation. This is what is called science! And it is for this

that Darwin is lauded to the skies, and called blessed among the generations of the devotees of science!

But we would direct attention to another apostle of science—Ernst Hæckel, professor of natural history in the University of Jena. The German naturalist, not satisfied with the assumptions of his English co-laborer, advances much farther. Taking the theory of evolution as demonstrated, he proceeds to trace out the genealogy of man, from his first monad ancestor to his final development into an anthropoid ape, and then into that species of animal that naturalists call *Homo Sapiens*. In his "Natural History of Creation," he boldly and unhesitatingly describes all the links in the chain. Many of these links, of palæozoic antiquity, are represented by animals, whose fossil remains, at least, are known to science. Others, however, never have had any existence outside of Hæckel's imagination. But this matters not. Hæckel's theory demands their existence, and that is sufficient reason for their reality. If they have not existed, they ought to have existed. And Hæckel gives all this as veritable science; as the undoubted conclusions of experiment and observation. And more than this, he expects it to be accepted as such—as something that has passed the requirements of demonstration—as something that can no longer be called in question.

But Hæckel does not stop here. He is prepared—men like Hæckel are always prepared for the accomplishment of difficult and impossible tasks—not only to give us a full genealogy of man from the simplest gelatinous monad, but he is also ready to tell how this humble albuminous ancestor of ours was produced from inorganic matter. He does not, of course, believe in a Creator. A belief in God would be anti-scientific, for the reason, Hæckel will tell us, that such a being is unnecessary. According to Hæckel, there exists nothing but matter and force, and these are eternal. Assuming this as unquestionable, he applies his monistic or mechanical theory, and gravely and grandiloquently tells us that all the various forms of organic and inorganic nature are simply the products of natural forces acting on matter. Carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, carbonic acid and nitrogen, under the multiple action of chemical affinity, electricity, solar heat, and a thousand and one other *unknown* causes, give birth to the simplest forms of animal and vegetable life, and lo! the mystery of creation is explained. As between the exploded theory of spontaneous generation—he calls it *autogenic* archigony—and creation, he unhesitatingly accepts the former. Any hypothesis, however wild or absurd it may be, that will enable him to evade admitting the existence of a personal God, Hæckel is prepared to accept and urge on the acceptance of others. He dresses up his theories in an interminable series of neologisms,

mostly derived from the Greek, which reminds one of the Macaronic volubility of the doctor of Molière, and having done this, he fancies, it would seem, that he has marshalled together so many arguments in true syllogistic form.

We challenge any one possessed of the least logical acumen to read Hæckel's "Evolution of Man," or his "History of Creation," and say that we have been guilty of any exaggeration in any statements we have made regarding his opinions, or the artifices to which he has recourse in stating and maintaining them. We do not mean, however, to imply that Hæckel is, as a naturalist, entirely devoid of merit. Far from it. As a patient and acute observer of facts and details, particularly in the domain of the lower forms of invertebrate life, he, like his English co-worker, Darwin, is entitled to his meed of praise. But it is when he attempts to generalize from the facts and phenomena observed, that Hæckel falls into the most stupid blunders, and into the most glaring absurdities.

Hæckel, like Huxley, Tyndall and Darwin, has written a number of works that have attracted more or less notice. Some of these are monographs of undoubted merit on purely scientific subjects; but those of his productions that have reached the general public are the ones embodying his atheistic views of creation, and his flighty imaginings regarding the natural history of animals and man. His observations and discoveries in biology are known only to a few naturalists, whereas the poison of his materialistic teaching has been disseminated, as is usual in such cases, over the whole world.

So much, then, for the four best-known and most popular representatives of modern scientific thought. Huxley and Darwin are not known for their original and extensive researches in biology, but rather for their evolutionary teachings, and for their confessed agnosticism. Tyndall is not as much known for his investigations in the domain of physical science as he is for his pronounced materialism. And Hæckel is famous,—or infamous, rather,—not for his studies of the lower forms of life, but for his theories regarding organic evolution, and for his proud and defiant atheism.

And what confirms the truth of what we have been saying, and what at the same time makes matters worse, is the belief in the popular mind—a belief, too, that is more general than most people are disposed to admit—that there is some intimate, if not necessary, connection between the sciences which these men pursue and their avowed irreligious tenets; that their openly-proclaimed agnosticism, materialism, atheism, must—as effect proceeds from cause—follow from their studies of nature and nature's laws. They

are looked upon as authoritative teachers, and their utterances on all subjects pertaining to philosophy and religion, no less than those relating to the sciences they profess, are regarded as infallible.

What we have said respecting the four coryphei, just named, of modern science may, with equal truth, be iterated of their less eminent but scarcely less notorious disciples. Carl Vogt, and Büchner, and Oscar Schmidt, and the late Paul Bert, take up the teachings of their masters, and carry them, if possible, to even greater extremes. The conclusions they draw are contained, if we will, in the false premises of their teachers, but it is only when the deduction is made that one realizes how terrible and inevitable these conclusions are. They are so wide-reaching that they embrace everything—science, philosophy, morals, religion. Nothing is sacred. And in the teachings of these men we are told that we have embodied the latest deductions of what is popularly known as science,—a science that carries with it the subversion of social order, of morality, of religion, and ends with a bold and positive negation of the immortality of the soul, and of the existence of a personal God.

According to Büchner, the *natural* origin of man is demonstrated beyond a peradventure of doubt, and has already taken its place among the most memorable discoveries of modern times.[1] From this to the conclusion of Mme. Clémence Royer, one of Darwin's translators, there is but a step. According to this French Darwiness, "Not only motion is transformed into sound, heat, electricity, light and reciprocally, but all these different forms of one force, which is always identical, are transformed into life, intelligence, will and voluntary action. . . . . Intelligence and thought, like extension, impenetrability and motion, are simply phenomena of matter."[2] Max Stirner, another member of the same school, sums up his faith more briefly: "There are," he says, "only two realities which I recognize,—myself and what I eat." A typical representative indeed of that proud and puffed-up class spoken of by the Apostle, that acknowledged "no God but their belly, and whose glory was their shame!"

One would think, to judge from such statements, that the sole object that some of our so-called scientists have in view in the study of nature, is the inventing of theories that will exclude God from the universe. But when one peruses the works of such men as Strauss, Vogt, Hæckel and Büchner, his suspicion becomes a conviction. They declare their real animus, and in terms that

---

[1] *Man in the Past, Present and Future*—Introduction.

[2] *Origine de l' Homme et des Societés*, p. 26.

cannot be misconstrued, when they avow, as they do, that "Today, thanks to Darwinism, the torment of the intelligence, meditating on the world and forced to admit finality, is soothed, and aspirations towards a First Cause are calmed. Natural selection has changed all that. It permits one to conceive of an end as unconsciously determined and as infallibly attained, and will replace God for a more happy posterity." Yes, according to Charles Martins, Darwin is "the Messiah of the natural sciences, and Darwinism the Gospel of modern times," or, as Renan would put it, Darwinism is "the grand explanation of the world and of true philosophy."

The danger to be apprehended from all these irreligious theories, and it were foolish to close our eyes to the danger, lies not so much in the errors they embody, but rather in the number of those who, with persistent unanimity, have devoted themselves to the propagation of such theories and the damnable errors with which they are all more or less impregnated. In referring to a similar subject the illustrious Cardinal Newman truly observes, that "The world is a collection of individual men, and any one of them may hold and take upon himself to profess un-Christian doctrine, and do his best to propagate it, but few have the power for such a work or the opportunity. It is by their union into one body, by the intercourse of man with man, and the consequent sympathy thence arising, that error spreads and becomes an authority. Its separate units which make up the body rely upon each other and upon the whole for the truth of their assertions, and thus assumptions and false reasonings are received without question as certain truths on the credit of alternate cheers, and appeals and *imprimaturs*."[1]

In what we have said we have given some of the most vaunted conclusions of those who are popularly regarded as the leaders among modern scientists. These conclusions—which, as we shall see, are as unwarranted as they are opposed to the principles of true science—embrace in their final summation the theory of the animal origin of man through organic evolution, and the pernicious atheistic doctrine which recognizes only matter and force.

These conclusions, however, as before stated, are only old errors in a new guise. They are arrayed in a garb demanded by the studies made in the various sciences in these latter days, but the dress used is only a vamped form of an old garment, and the errors which it is designed to adorn, or conceal rather, are only the Protean shapes of the materialism and atheism that was proclaimed by Greek and Roman sophists twenty or thirty centuries ago. Tyndall, Hæckel, Vogt, Büchner and their school have merely re-

[1] *Contemporary Review*, May, 1885.

peated, in modern scientific terminology, the self-same errors that the Doctor of the Gentiles found dominant when he preached in Athens, and which he was called upon to confute when he went to announce the Gospel of Christ in the palaces of the Cæsars on the banks of the Tiber.

And yet more. Our modern scientists have not only reiterated the errors that have obtained, in one form or another, for the last three thousand years, but they have also shown themselves just as wanting in unanimity of opinion as did their materialistic and atheistic predecessors of times long past. They agree, it is true, in maintaining what, on final analysis, would prove to be one and the same error,—negation of God and free will,—but they are not at one as to the way of giving expression to their errors, or as to what should or should not be adduced in support of their impious theories.

Huxley, for instance, like Darwin, is an evolutionist, but he does not at all agree with Darwin in assigning to "Natural Selection" all that is claimed for it by the plausible author of the "Origin of Species," and of "The Descent of Man." Hæckel differs from both Huxley and Darwin, and insists on views to which neither of his English co-laborers would subscribe. Indeed, so radical is he, and so gratuitous in his statements, that one will find few among scientists that are not acknowledged disciples of Hæckel, who are prepared to go the same lengths as the Professor of Jena. Hæckel coolly draws up the genealogy of man, and pictures for our inspection the different links of the chain from the first monad down to the last ape-man,—or, as he puts it, the last pithecanthropoid,—and then has the assurance to ask us to give to his fiction the same credence that we should give to the genealogies of the royal families of France or England.

Carl Vogt, one of the high-chiefs of evolution, spoke more truthfully than he knew, and certainly with more force than he intended, when he stated that, "The discussion respecting the origin of man—a discussion that is characterized by its comparatively slight animation in other civilized countries—has reached its apogee in Germany, and has assumed a character singularly bitter and passionate. There has been a deluge of brochures, verses, and caricatures, even, in which each one overwhelms his adversary with arguments more or less ridiculous, and assails him with opprobious and calumnious epithets. There are two distinct camps,—the one under the direction of Mr. Hæckel, who maintains that man is in a direct lineage with the venerable Amphioxus and the Ascidians; whilst M. Semper and his valiant adherents insist on a relationship that is more direct with, and approximates more closely to, the Annelides."

Virchow, the founder of cellular pathology, and Hæckel's teacher, pertinently remarks, in speaking of the theory of evolution, or transformism as he prefers to call it, that, "Rarely does one see a problem as important as transformism treated in a more trifling, I might say, more absurd, manner. If to establish a theory it were necessary only to select and combine phenomena after a certain fashion, we might all, whoever we are, quietly sit by our fireside, smoke our cigar and construct our little theory." In his celebrated address before the German naturalists and physicians at Munich, on "Freedom of Science in the Modern State," he goes further and declares; "Every positive progress which we have made in the region of prehistoric anthropology has removed us further from the demonstration of this relation." All his more recent utterances, moreover, in reference to the theory of evolution are in accord with this statement. And Du Bois-Reymond, who stands at the head of German physiological science, says, in reference to Hæckel's genesis of man, that his "Genealogical trees have, in the eyes of science, about as much value as have the genealogical trees of the heroes of Homer in the eyes of historical criticism."

When, to adduce another instance, it comes to discuss the length of the period of man's existence on earth, the views of our "advanced" scientists and their followers are equally extravagant, and reveal, if anything, a less accordant spirit than that which presides over their speculations concerning man's origin.

The question of man's antiquity has been a favorite one with infidels, materialists, and atheists, ever since the time of Voltaire. They seem to imagine that if they can prove the antiquity of man to be greater than that which they have been pleased to find in the Bible, that they thereby impugn the truth of the Scriptures, and sap the very foundations of revealed religion. We shall not now indicate wherein lies the falsity of their reasoning, but content ourselves with giving some idea of what persistent and desperate attempts they have made to establish their theories, and how signal, in every case, have been their failures.

The first time the Biblical chronology was seriously called in question was towards the latter part of the last century. The attack was first made in the name of astronomy, and conducted by some of the ablest scientists of the age. Among these were M. Bailly, the distinguished French astronomer, and Prof. Playfair, of Edinburgh, one of the most eminent mathematicians of his time. In support of their onslaught, they brought forward certain astronomical tables of Hindoo origin, and insisted on it, that these tables clearly evinced the fact that observations were made by Hindoo astronomers over 4000 years before the

Christian era, and that, consequently, the period of man's existence on earth was much greater than that indicated by the generally received Biblical chronology.

The conclusions, however, of Playfair and Bailly did not stand the test of criticism. Their calculations were soon proven to be false, and it was shown that the sacred books of the Hindoos afford no more evidence for the fabled antiquity of man than do the mythical dynasties of China or Babylon.

A few years later, a greater sensation was produced by the discovery of the now famous zodiacs of Esne and Dendarah during the expedition of Napoleon into Egypt. Dupuis, a distinguished French *savant* contended that the temples in which these zodiacs were found must have been at least 15,000 years old. Other investigators were content with an antiquity of 12,000 years. Many scientists were now sure that they had evidence that could not be questioned, and infidels boastfully proclaimed that the Christian chronology was set aside as a myth. But just at the most heated period of the discussion—a discussion in which the whole civilized world was interested—the illustrious Champollion, the discoverer of the hieroglyphical alphabet of ancient Egypt, came forward and proved to a certainty that the much-vaunted zodiacs referred to schemes of nativity in connection with judicial astrology, and belonged to a period not antecedent to the first and second centuries of the Christian era.

Disconcerted and worsted in their astronomical campaign, the forces of error and their scientific allies, although loth to acknowledge defeat, prepared at once to reconnoitre for a vantage ground in a more propitious and in a less accessible field. They soon found the object of their quest in the new, and then unexplored, domains of geology and prehistoric archæology. Unable to cope with the soldiers of truth on the broad, open plain, and in the clear light of the suns and constellations of heaven, the enemies of revelation and of true science betook themselves to the dark and tangled forests of the mountain fastnesses. Here they at once began a guerilla warfare with weapons of an entirely different character from those which they had previously used; and, with these, they flattered themselves that they would soon march to certain victory.

One squad would get behind a shell-mound and assail its enemies with the calcareous remains of the cockle and periwinkle; another would entrench itself in some gravel pit, and thence hurl a shower of flint arrows and palæolithic javelins; and still another would seek concealment in some weird, damp, gloomy cave, and from the darkness thereof project the fragmentary bones of extinct bears, hyenas, and pachyderms, and, occasionally, too, in the way

of a *coup de grace*, the ghastly cranium of some hapless mortal, who, in an age long past, had died and found his final resting place in this self-same cavern.

To pass from the language of figure to the language of fact, the argument briefly stated was this: Researches in the dim and prehistoric past, and notably in the fertile fields of anthropology, have brought to light a number of facts, that, as contended by a number of scientists, and a still larger number of infidel sciolists, prove unquestionably that man's antiquity must be much greater than any rational interpretation of Scripture would permit one to assign.

The evidence in support of the argument comes in the form of ancient human remains and human implements and monuments which recently have been discovered, and about which much has been said and written. We are referred to fossil remains of man found buried deep in the solid rock, the formation of which above and around the remains found, must, we are informed, have required untold ages—periods of time that can be reckoned only by tens of thousands of years. We are told of the fossil man of Guadalupe, found imbedded in the shell and coral limestone of Guadalupe in the West Indies; of the fossil man of Denis, discovered under a lava deposit from an extinct volcano in Auvergne, France; of the fossil man of Mentone, in Italy; of the skulls of Cro-Magnon and Neanderthal, and of fossil remains of like character found in various parts of the Old and of the New World. We are forced to listen to learned disquisitions on the round towers of Ireland; on the weems and burghs and pillar-stones of Scotland; on the rock-cut temples of India and Arabia Petra, and the no less famous structures and monuments of Central America and Yucatan. We are overwhelmed with the relics of ancient Swiss lake-dwellings and Danish kitchen-middings, and are compelled to inspect specimens, whose number is legion, from all the bone-caves and peat and gravel deposits of Europe, and all this because some theorist, forsooth,—some scientific monomaniac, we should say—will have it that he has found in some peculiarly-shaped flint, that might have been fashioned by the action of the elements themselves, as well as by human hands, or in some piece of pottery, an irrefragable argument in support of his notion of the fabled antiquity of his ancestors, who, by the way, he will just as strongly insist, are in a direct line of descent from some extinct family of anthropomorphous apes. It is, indeed, a pity that we cannot consistently tell such a one that we believe him, and that, in *his* case at least, we are disposed to accept his conclusions as the expression of the truth.

But let us give the results, expressed in numbers, of some of the

conclusions of a few of our popular geologists and anthropologists respecting the antiquity of man.

The illustrious naturalist, Count Pourtales, finds fossil human remains in a freshwater sandstone in Florida, and Prof. Louis Agassiz forthwith estimates them to be "by a moderate computation," ten thousand years old. A certain Mr. Horner comes across some pieces of pottery and burnt bricks at various depths in the mud deposits of the Nile, and makes calculations—in which Sir John Lubbock and Sir Charles Lyell substantially agree—which require for man an antiquity of at least thirteen thousand years. Other geologists, by computations based on these same pieces of pottery and burnt bricks, will extend the 13,000 to 60,000 years. Jukes, an English geologist, puts the antiquity of the human period at 100,000 years. According to Lyell and Lubbock, palæolithic man must date back some 200,000 years. Prof. Fuhlrott makes an exhaustive study of the Neanderthal skull—a human cranium that attracted an immense deal of attention at the time of its discovery—and claims for it an antiquity of from 200,000 to 300,000 years. Mr. Vivian, another geologist, from certain fossils discovered in a cave in Devonshire, estimates the duration of the human period in England at 264,000 years. Subsequently these figures were extended to 1,000,000. Dr. Hunt, at one time president of the British Anthropological Society, thinks that Mr. Vivian's estimate, high as it is, is insufficient. He goes to work and figures the antiquity of our race to be full 9,000,000 years.

Again, many geologists, among them Mr. James Geike, contend that man existed before the glacial periods, the beginning of which, according to Mr. Jas. Croll, the astronomer, dates back 240,000 years. Scientists, however, are not at one in their estimates of either the date or the duration of the glacial period. Mr. Evan Hopkins, F.G.S., says that there are geologists who place back the beginning of the glacial age at 1,280,000,000 years. If, then, man is pre-glacial, according to these geologists, he has an antiquity before which the age claimed for him by Manetho and Berosus, in their dynasties of Egypt and Babylon, fall into insignificance. Even the countless and everlasting dynasties of the Chinese can produce nothing that will give man a more truly venerable antiquity than the estimates given by the geologists just mentioned.

But we are not yet through with our geological computations. Prof. Huxley goes even further than his *confrères*, and thinks that man is not only pre-glacial, but that "he existed when a tropical fauna and flora flourished in our northern clime." Man, then, must have existed in the carboniferous age; an age which all geologists teach us was long anterior to the glacial period, and an

age which most of them contend was millions, if not hundreds of millions, of years earlier than the comparatively recent age of ice and glaciers. And still more; there are those who, contending for the eternity of existence of matter, would fain believe that man has a still greater antiquity than that claimed for him by the geologists named, and are disposed to insist that his existence on earth, if not quite eternal, runs back so far, and embraces such countless æons that it is impossible to give expression to such duration in numbers.

But enough of such figures and surmises. We wish to know what foundation in fact there is for such conjectures respecting the antiquity of our race, why there is such a wide divergence in the results obtained, and what conclusions have been reached by more conservative, although equally eminent investigators, and what, in a word, are the views of Christian and Catholic *savans* regarding this most interesting question.

All, or nearly all conclusions, like those indicated, are based, as we already have stated, on calculations concerning the age of human remains and human implements, etc., to some of which we have just alluded. The marked divergence in the results obtained is owing to the lack, in most cases, of any reliable means of determining, even approximately, the age of the objects found. The age of a human bone, or of any kind of implement of human fabrication, is ordinarily arrived at by computing the amount of time necessary to form the deposits, be they of rock, mud or peat, in which such human remains are found.

Let us illustrate by a case in point. Some forty years ago, M. Boucher de Perthes, a French *savant*, discovered a large number of articles of human fabrication in the peat deposits of the valley of the Somme, in France. His discoveries were so startling, and gave, according to his interpretations of them, such a great antiquity to the human race, that at first they were received with distrust on all sides. They did not, however, attract any special attention from scientists generally until about the year 1860.

According to M. Boucher de Perthes, measurements of the peat in which the articles referred to were found, was formed at the rate of about an inch and a half, or two inches a century. Sir Charles Lyell, Sir John Lubbock, and other well known scientists, after making an extended examination of these same peat beds, and the objects found therein, were disposed to accept M. Boucher de Perthes's estimate concerning the rate of formation of the peat, and to regard the various objects found in it as having a very great antiquity indeed. In some places the peat mentioned had a depth of twenty-six feet, and must therefore, according to M. Boucher

de Perthes, and Lyell and Lubbock, have required for its formation a period embracing from twelve to eighteen thousand years.

But we can appreciate better the trustworthiness of such observations and computations by comparisons with discoveries made in similar formations elsewhere.

In the catalogue of the antiquities in the museum of the Royal Irish Academy, we are told of a leather shoe found twenty feet below the surface in a peat bog in Tipperary. In the same catalogue, mention is made of a large vessel of butter discovered in the turf at the depth of eighteen feet, in the county of Kilkenny. If, then, we are to believe M. Boucher de Perthes and Sir Charles Lyell and Sir John Lubbock, and scientists of their stamp, the Irish were wearing leather shoes and making butter upwards of ten or twelve thousand years ago. *Risum teneatis amici.*[1]

We may add in this connection, that sober and more extended observation has shown that peat can be and has been formed at a much more rapid rate than that assigned by the geologists just named. There are well-authenticated instances of peat being formed at the rate of a foot or two, or even more, per century. Dr. Andrews and others who have taken up the subject of the peat deposits of the Somme valley, maintain that a careful investigation will prove that the time demanded for their formation has been greatly exaggerated. Four or five thousand years is the maximum of time they are disposed to allow, and they think that half that time is amply sufficient.

In the same way eminent geologists and archæologists, whose authority and erudition cannot be questioned, cut down the exaggerated estimates that have been given to the glacial period and to the age of the various human remains that have been found, and to that of the divers works of art or industry that have been attributed to prehistoric man. Instead of the hundreds of thousands, or millions of years, that have been assigned to the human period, it has been demonstrably shown that there is no valid reason for claiming for it an antiquity greater than eight or ten thousand years at most. In other words, as far as any positive knowledge in geology and prehistoric archæology goes, these sciences can make no claims that are in conflict with the general statements of Scripture regarding the age of our race.[2]

The trouble in geology is that we have no means of reckoning time in years—no positive *data* that can serve as units of measure.

---

[1] See *The Recent Origin of Man*, by James C. Southall, p. 465.

[2] See on this subject the recent scholarly work, *Modern Science in Bible Lands*, by Sir J. W. Dawson, LL.D., F. R. S., F. G. S. It is the most concise and masterly statement of the results arrived at by science in this interesting field of research that we have yet seen.

All geological calculations, expressed in years, are simply guesses —conjectures, more or less probable—more or less fanciful and extravagant. But, it is only among Christian geologists that we observe a disposition to acknowledge the full force of the difficulty. Geologists of infidel and materialistic tendencies are loath to admit that the lack of some unit of measure is sufficient to vitiate all their calculations. They still insist that their computations, however diverse, and however long the periods of time required—must be right, because, as they will have it, the Bible, with its cosmogony, genealogies and all, is wrong. Truly, it requires faith, more than sufficient to move mountains, to be an infidel or modern scientist in good standing.

The great American and, we may add, Christian, geologist, J. D. Dana, who occupies an undisputed place in the front rank of the great geologists of the age, makes no attempt to determine the number of years that go to make up any of the epochs or periods that geology speaks of, but simply limits himself to the statement of the general proposition: "Time is long."

M. A. de Lapparent, the eminent Catholic geologist, in his recent admirable "Traité de Geologie,"—said to be the most complete and reliable work on geology, extant,—declares that the data on which the geologist is obliged to rely, "are so vague that according to the point of view which one adopts, the figures may vary from one to twenty; sometimes from one to a hundred, and yet even these extreme results deserve scarcely more credence than the others. Wherefore, we must accept with the greatest reserve the numerical results which diverse authors pretend to have attained."

But physics and astronomy furnish us with still stronger reasons for withholding assent to the gratuitous assumptions and exorbitant demands made by a certain class of geologists and biologists for the unlimited secular periods which their speculations require. Instead of the hundreds of millions of years exacted by the advocates of evolution, Professors W. Thompson and P. G. Tait, who are conceded to be without superiors in their special lines of research, tell us that calculations, based on the laws of thermodynamics,—something much more trustworthy than the *data* geologists have to compute from—prove that it would have been simply impossible for any form of animal or vegetable life to have existed on the earth for a greater period of time than ten, or, at most, fifteen million years.[1]

Unlike the results reached by geologists, we here have con-

[1] See the *Recent Advances in Physical Science*, by P. G. Tait, M.A., 3d edition, lectures VI. and VII.

clusions that are based on measurable units and calculable quantities. We have a mathematical problem, resting on experimental data of physics, and the answer to this problem affords us an argument against the unwarranted deductions of geologists, that is simply irrefutable.

In a recent lecture, before the Royal Institution in London, Sir William Thompson emphasizes the conclusions he had previously arrived at, and, applying to the discussion of the sun's heat the same methods he had employed in the problem respecting the thermal condition and age of the earth, he declares that it is impossible "to suppose that the sun has existed for more than twenty million years, no matter what may have been its origin—whether it came into existence from the clash of worlds pre-existing, or from diffused nebulous matter. "There is," he says, "a great clinging by geologists and biologists to vastly longer periods, but the physicist, treating it,"—viz., the duration of solar and terrestrial heat,—"as a dynamic question, with calculable elements cannot come to any other conclusion than the one stated."

Mr. H. Faye, one of the ablest astronomers of the age, and a Catholic, goes even farther and draws up an argument, that is, if anything, more trenchant than that of either Thompson or Tait. In his masterly work, *Sur l'Origine du Monde*,"[1] he states it as his belief, founded on well known physical and astronomical laws, that the sun, assuming, as he may, that the amount of heat annually radiated by it to have been the same since its formation as it is now, cannot possibly have a greater age than 14,500,000 years. To this he adds, what must strike every one as unquestionable, that, for those who admit the nebular hypothesis of Laplace—and all geologists and biologists pin their faith to this hypothesis—the difficulties presented by the results of his calculations, to the acceptance of the long life-periods which geologists claim, is simply insoluble.

The errors and the changing and contradictory opinions we have referred to regarding the antiquity of man, and, incidentally, the life-period of the earth, are not, however, restricted to this special subject of investigation. On the contrary, they obtain, even in a more marked degree if that be possible, in every other department of what is currently denominated "Modern Science." We have the same cloud of error and conflicting opinion enveloping subjects that are most intimately associated with the gravest questions of philosophy and theology. This is particularly true of such problems as those concerning the origin and nature of man, the unity of species, and other problems of an equally vital nature embraced in the general theory of evolution. But we have not

[1] Chap. xiv.

space to discuss these questions now, for they would each require far more than could be allotted them. Indeed, each would afford abundant material for a separate article. But, if examined, they would only tend to confirm what has already been demonstrated. Let it suffice for the present to have alluded to them. From what has been said so far in the course of this article, we can see what we are called upon to accept as science. We have learned also *en passant* something of those who would present themselves as our teachers and as the exponents of the "New Philosophy."

The science—we refer to the sham science we have been considering—is nothing more than the vain and idle imaginings of those who, in the language of Tertullian, "fail to see that which is, and imagine that which is not." It is a science "garrulous, declaiming, canting, wrangling"; a science barren of useful things, and "meanly proud of its own unprofitableness." It is a fuming, frothing, vaporing gushing of words, and an incoherent syllabling and mouthing of names, as dauntless in its effrontery as it is persistent in its attempts to hoist and foist itself into the elevated and sacred shrines of true science and true philosophy. It ends, as has been said of the sophistry of the Greeks, in nothing but disputation and incertitude. "It is neither a vineyard nor an olive ground, but an intricate wood of briers and thistles, from which those who lose themselves in it bring back many scratches and no food." It is, in a word, simply a continuation in a new form, and with variations, of the futile and trifling "disputes of the orthodox Lilliputians and the heretical Blefuscudians about the big ends and the little ends of eggs."

As to the high priests and expositors of this so-called science, we can say of them, in the language of Macaulay, that "we have been for some time past inclined to suspect that these people, whom some regard as the lights of the world and others as incarnate demons, are, in general, ordinary men, with narrow understandings and little information." We can apply to them, each according to his measure, what Ruskin says in his own telling language of that much overrated naturalist, Charles Darwin: "He attracts the attention only of vainly curious and idly skeptical persons, and has collected in the train of him every impudent imbecility in Europe, like a dim comet wagging its useless tail of phosphorescent nothing across the steadfast stars."

Yes, these exponents of modern science—more particularly its German and French representatives—will flippantly talk of our gaseous and albuminoid ancestors, and express surprise if one should venture to dissent from any of their views, however extravagant. They will deny the glorious origin of the human family as declared in the Book of books, and then work with the

incessancy and malignity and desperation of a Mephistopheles to show that man, the lord of creation, descends in a direct line from some favored worm or sea-squirt; from some privileged mud-fish or catarrhine ape. They will prate glibly about the souls of animals and plants, and insist on our denying the immortality of our own. They will ask us to give up our faith and plunge with them into the mælstrom of materialism or an all-absorbing pantheism; and in lieu of those sacred truths on which have ever been based the hope, the joy, the consolation of our race, they will offer us in return a dark, cold, forbidding atheism. In the words of the poet,

> "They cast on all things surest, sweetest, best,
> Doubt, insecurity, astonishment."

OXFORD, ANCIENT AND MODERN.

Oxford. By Andrew Lang, M.A. (Seeley & Co.).
The Early History of Oxford: 727–1100 (Oxford Historical Society).
Collectanea (1st series). Edited by C. R. L. Fletcher, Fellow of All Souls (Oxford).
Short Studies in Modern Oxford. By D. H. Bynne (Oxford).
Hand-Book for University of Oxford Students (Clarendon Press).

"THAT colleges which were originally founded to help the poor scholar should have become institutions existing mainly for the purpose of fleecing him, is a most disgraceful fact; but so it is, and indeed we find the same abuse in our great public schools." So writes Mr. Bynne, in his short but caustic "studies" of the modern misuses of the University. The pith of the remark is less in the sarcasm than in the deep mourning over the days that are past. "Originally founded to help the poor scholar" might be written over many of the college gates; though it is probable that modern scholars, like modern dons, would resent such a very personal reflection. True, there are still many foundations at Oxford which largely benefit a number of poor scholars; but the point is that the *idea* of the University is now conventional, instead of being as it used to be, charitable. Indeed the word charitable cannot now be fitly used, in its application to the

appropriation of endowments. No word has come to be more degraded than the word charitable; which, in the early ages, meant "moved by the love of God." Among the pagans the word seems to have meant gracious, or favoring, or possibly the doing a thing for the sake of some equivalent; but in its first Christian sense it implied that the *giver* was under obligation to the recipient who enabled him to please God. Humility was, therefore, the attitude of the giver; not, as in these days, the attitude of the recipient. Charity means now both humiliation in the recipient and condescension in the self-worshipful bestower. And so keen is the humiliation that, both at Oxford and Cambridge, a man educated on the foundation is looked down upon. The servitors at Oxford, like the sizars at Cambridge, are "an inferior race of animals academical." Thirty years ago it was the custom at Christ Church College for the poor servitors to dine *after* the rich students; just as it was the custom for noblemen to wear gold tassels on their caps, and for gentlemen-commoners to wear gowns made of silk, to distinguish them from the herd of undergraduates. Modernism has made Oxford a social institution, whereas the founders designed only an academical. So, too, modernism has made Oxford a freethinking university, whereas the founders designed only a Catholic. The word charitable, which, before the Reformation, had the sense of including all men in Catholic fellowship, now almost excludes from so much as a social fellowship the pitiful recipients of Catholic bounty. Thus the two ideas are more opposite than are two religions; they are as opposite as religion and irreligion. They are indeed so hopelessly irreconcilable that no one now thinks of Oxford as being primarily Christian, but only as being, accidentally, not anti-Christian.

A good deal of controversy has been recently revived in England on the following two aspects of the University: 1. Its influence on the young minds of the undergraduates; 2. Its influence on the religious opinions of those clergymen who have graduated after three years of residence. Now both of these aspects must be approached apologetically—that is, with reference to the great past. Ancient Oxford, primitive Oxford, gathered to its broken homes—to its still migratory and unendowed schools—all young men who chose to come to it from any country, and to submit themselves to the rules of the religious orders. It is not easy perhaps in our own time to picture that infant Oxford which preceded any attempt at a university; before the time when the "Oxenford" village and the "Oxenford" schools had ceased to quarrel over their priority of rights. As the village grew into the town, and the schools grew into colleges, the quarrels grew more frequent and more serious; and it is ob-

servable that the earliest charters granted to colleges were in reparation for the injuries done by townsmen. It was in the proportion of the growth of culture throughout the kingdom that the importance of the Oxford schools became appreciated. During the eight centuries which preceded the Reformation, the life of the whole nation, intellectually and politically, stamped its story on the development of Oxford. It would be unreal perhaps to treat critically of those mythological foundations which romance has loved to lay in King Alfred's time; nor is there any good to be gained by speculating what Oxford *may* have been under Roman and Saxon settlements or Danish invasions. It is tolerably certain that neither in the twelfth or thirteenth century were colleges or college statutes so much as known. It is tolerably certain that there was no Oxford University—though there had for centuries been Oxford schools of severe discipline—until the period when, about the close of the fourteenth century, town and gown managed to harmonize their differences. We must be content to know that the University was a product of the middle ages; of those ages when Catholic wisdom created monuments of charity such as no Protestant intellect could have originated.

Let us take a hasty glance at ancient Oxford, at Oxford mediæval, and therefore Catholic. And first, as to Christ Church, though comparatively a modern college—claiming Cardinal Wolsey for its founder—we must remember that it is the heir of a Catholic beneficence which dates back to the close of the eighth century. That St. Frideswyde built a retreat for holy virgins on the plot of ground which is now occupied by the college is not disputed by even skeptical antiquarians; and as we pass to-day through the Quadrangle and Peckwater and Canterbury, we can spare a thought for the seven centuries which preceded Cardinal Wolsey, the munificent if proud subject of Henry VIII. A portrait of that monarch, and also a portrait of Queen Elizabeth, are hung upon the walls of the great dining-hall; while a portrait of the fallen Cardinal adorns the same hall, in silent satire upon the horrors of the Reformation. But within a stone's throw of Christ Church are other colleges, whose completed fabrics are older by many centuries. To quote the words of the charters of such colleges is to convey their whole object, their whole faith. "All Souls'" College, for example, needs no volume save its title to tell all men *why* its founders endowed it. "*Collegium omnium animarum fidelium defunctorum de Oxon.*" What need is there of any explanation? The students of this college were also commanded by its founders to "pray specially for the souls of Henry V., Henry VII., the Duke of Clarence, and for the souls of all the dukes, earls, barons, knights, esquires and other subjects of the Crown of Eng-

land who had fallen in the war with France, and for the souls of *all* the faithful departed." An indulgence of forty days was also conceded to "all Christians who might live within the province of Canterbury, who should visit the chapel and devoutly pray for the souls of the faithful departed." And what a chapel must this have been—for it is impossible to avoid making the reflection—before the spoliators, Grindall and Parker, and other monsters of the age of the Reformation, destroyed the eight altars, stole the chapel plate, desecrated the costly missals, grails and processionals, and ordered all the Fellows to utterly deface all copes, albs and crosses, and to remove every token of Catholic times. We will not linger, however, at "All Souls' College," but will pass on hastily to Balliol College—for the sake only of recalling the spirit of ancient Oxford. Masses were commanded to be said in perpetuity—so runs the charter of Balliol College—for the souls of all the founders and of their kindred; while the authorities of the college were laid under obligation to chant requiems for the wife of the founder, so long as Balliol should continue to be a college. And so again as to Magdalen College, "the most absolute building in Oxford," as King James the First not unfittingly styled it, a Mass was commanded by Waynflete, the founder, to be said for "the souls of good memory, to wit, for Henry III., Edward III., Henry VI., Edward IV., for the founder, his parents, for Lord Cromwell, Sir John Fastolf, and other good patrons of the college, on every day in the year, very early in the morning"; and this mass has been "commuted," to quote the scandalous expression of the authorities, who cared no more for the holy souls than for their own souls, "for a choral performance once a year on the top of Waynflete's tower," in bitter mockery of the pious bequest of the founder. Of "Corpus Christi College," let it be noted that her charter contained the order: "The founder, to the praise and honor of God Almighty, the most holy body of Christ, and the Blessed Virgin Mary, as also of the Apostles Peter, Paul and Andrew, and of St. Cuthbert, St. Swithin, and St. Bidin, doth found and appoint this college always to be called Corpus Christi College." And of New College let one word be added, not so much in regard to the piety of its Catholic founder, as in respect of that spirit of Catholic beneficence which always thought first of educating the poor, and indeed designed colleges for them alone. The grand idea of this college was to "provide for the perfect maintenance and instruction of two hundred scholars, to afford them a liberal support, and to lead them through a complete course of education, from the first elements of letters, through the whole circle of the sciences; from the lowest class of grammatical learning to the highest degrees of the several faculties." The object of

the founder has been well nigh obliterated from the actual conduct of our own times; it has been treated with as much contempt as was shown to the original art-work, which made New College one of the gems of the world. Whatever was grand in Plantagenet ideal, and sumptuous in the refinements of art, once adorned the typical chapel of New College, and would have adorned it to-day, but for the Reformation savages who swooped down on everything that was beautiful. To rob churches of their silver and gold, and efface the fairest monuments of art, was the special mission of the English Reformers, whose ignorance and vulgarity might have been excuse for their impiety, had not impiety engendered them both.

We need only linger a moment longer on ancient Oxford, to note its spirit of stern practical wisdom as well as of Catholic piety. Such men as Waynflete and Sir Thomas Pope, Wykeham, Edmund le Riche, and Walter de Merton, were men of thoroughly practical minds: Witness the splendid endowments they have left for the many colleges so magnificently raised, and therefore the inheritance *we* have from *them*, the inheritance of both their faith and their works. These men did not think of themselves, they thought of us. In the provision which they critically made for poor scholars, they had in view the generations which were to follow; just as in the severe rules for their colleges, rules academical and disciplinal, they provided for the forming of such characters as would best hand on the faith to posterity. And so, too, in regard to pure scholarship, their notions were as practical as they were earnest. It is almost amusing to note the difference between the scholarly habits of ancient Oxford and the anything but scholarly habits of modern Oxford. One example shall suffice—taken from Balliol. In "those dark days of ignorance and superstition," as our Protestant friends love to designate the Middle Ages, every scholar was compelled to speak Latin during meal-time; and, in case of disobedience, the delinquent was served last, and if obstinate he was finally expelled. This is only a suggestive instance of that practical view of education which utterly died out in the sixteenth century. Just as the Reformation killed piety, killed art, killed the comeliness and seemliness of Christian worship, so did it kill the practical side of life, equally in regard to education and to religion, to the culture of the imagination and of the virtues.

We will take Mr. Andrew Lang for our authority—and his new edition of "Oxford" shows his thorough command of the period when Oxford was "reformed" by barbarians—as to the utter ruin which was wrought upon Oxford by the supplanting of Catholicism by Protestantism. Speaking of the reign of Edward VI., which followed immediately on the death of Henry VIII.,

and was, therefore, the first reign of a Protestant prince, Mr. Lang says: "The reign of Edward VI. gave full play to that fanatic and intolerable hatred of letters which had now and again made its voice to be heard under Henry VIII. Oxford was almost empty. The schools were used by laundresses as a place where clothes might conveniently be dried. The citizens encroached on academical property. Some schools were quite destroyed, and the sites converted into gardens. Few men took degrees. The college plate and jewels, left by pious benefactors, were stolen and went to the melting pot. Thus flourished Oxford under Edward VI." Now, be it remembered that Mr. Andrew Lang is an Anglican, and a fellow of Merton College, Oxford. He is not prejudiced, therefore, against the Reformers. The same authority, when speaking of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, tells us that Oxford had sunk so low in the type and the culture of her professors that, when Queen Elizabeth paid a visit to the university, "Oxford could not even provide a university preacher." In other words, a university which but a few years before, during the reigns of English Catholic sovereigns, had been the equal in learning and in aspirations of any university in the world, had come to be so utterly degraded that young Englishmen would not condescend to matriculate, and the best professors were quite unfit to preach a sermon.

This allusion to Queen Elizabeth will bring our survey down to the period when the ancient Oxford gave place to the modern Oxford. It would be a long task, and a useless one, to trace Oxford through the periods which have been styled the Caroline, the Jacobite, the Georgian; just as it would be wearisome to go through the religious epochs, the evangelical, the tractarian, the ritualistic. We may now at once approach the two (perfectly modern) questions which Englishmen are asking with some interest: (1.) What is the influence of the university on the minds of the undergraduates? (2.) What is the influence of the university on the religious opinions of those clergymen who have passed three years in *statu pupillare*, and who are, therefore, all their lives Oxford men?

II.

Mr. Bynne, an accomplished Anglican, has written amusingly, yet perhaps sadly, on the influence of Oxford on undergraduates. He runs through the several grooves of Oxford life, and portrays, with much vividness, numerous characters. The curious and anomalous types of Oxford dons, the official entertainments which they are pleased to give, the grave and the playful pursuits of the undergraduates, with their literary and academical ideas, are all

successfully pictured, though sarcastically. It would seem that the modern Oxford has exaggerated some of the bad features which were first imprinted on it by the "Reforming" pagans; so that what is really good in Oxford life, is in spite of, not in harmony with, the present spirit or atmosphere of the University. The recent immense changes in the authoritative teaching of Oxford—so far as dons could ever be spoken of as teachers—have had this result, that the old-fashioned clerical don has given place to the free-thinking or the unattached. There is still, of course, a majority of High Church, reverend dons; but the doing-away with the necessity of *all* Oxford men being Anglicans, has weakened the sentiment of veneration for the Church of England. The don, forty years ago, whatever might be his defects, impersonated the highest Anglican ideal; in the sense, that is, of his principle of "Church and State," if not always in the sense of clerical example. He is now an institution which presupposes some sort of Anglicanism as the most respectable of the party leanings of English Protestantism; but he is no longer what he used to be, the (presumed) authoritative teacher as to the orthodoxy of this or that Anglican party. Forty years ago, in spite of the variety of "religious schools," there was an ardent conviction of the divine truth of Christianity; the very earnestness of religious controversy proving how deep was the realization of the necessity of believing *some* Christian doctrines. It was a little cruel, perhaps, of the "University Test-Committee," rather more than a quarter of a century ago, to affirm of Oxford philosophy that it led straightway to skepticism, and that "happy was he who, when he had finished his course, still believed in the divinity of Christ." Few Oxford men, who knew Oxford in 1850, would like to indorse so very sweeping a condemnation. It might have been truer to say that the logical consequences of Oxford were in the direction of putting egoism before authority; but, happily, Protestants are not logical in their religion, however logical they may be in secular grooves. Oxford men, like other men, are educated by their own thought a good deal more than by school-syllogisms or Q. E. D's. It has been said truly that "such men as Laud, Addison, or Sir Robert Peel, owed their greatness, not to having been at Oxford, but to having educated themselves by their own thought—a thought which was independent of Oxford." Narrowness or width is born in a man, nor does a university create much or destroy much. A man's "set" may bias his mind in certain grooves, but his real bent was made before he matriculated. And so we should rather exalt the early training, which taught a simple Anglican rule of piety, than praise (or blame) the dons who did *not* teach anything at all; teach, that is, in the sense of a derived authority,

as Catholic professors teach theology in Catholic colleges. Catholics have to remember, in judging a Protestant university, that its undergraduates have never believed in Catholic dogma; they have believed only in what they call Scriptural truth, and these truths have been privately interpreted, not in the sense of wayward opinion, but in the sense of exercising the *duty* of private judgment. So that, if a Low Churchman become a High Churchman at the University, or an Evangelical become an easy Latitudinarian, the change may have been made through a sincere exercise of that eclecticism which is the born *duty* of every English Protestant mind. A Catholic naturally imagines that a disesteem for Christian dogma must lead quickly, perhaps inevitably, to infidelity. This is not so in the case of persons brought up Protestants. They may retain the sentiment of "belief in Christ," and not only the sentiment but the deep assurance, after they have set aside a good many Christian doctrines, as what they are pleased to call "matters of no importance."

This attitude of the Protestant mind has to be considered in conjunction with a (possible) contempt for every kind of religious system. In the case of the undergraduate at a university, he may look upon going to chapel as a formal bore; he may regard his particular dons as pyramidal impostors, who enjoy their comfortable fellowships and are paid to pray; he may also think of the Church of England as a State compromise, designed to include every divergent opinion on Christian doctrine; and yet, for all this, he may be a thorough Christian at heart, so far as belief goes in the divine fact of man's redemption. It was necessary to say so much, before speaking of particular "influences" in the direction of good or bad in the undergraduate life. Protestantism is a continuously constructive personal orthodoxy. But though it can never attain to doctrinal fixedness, it need not, therefore, abandon "faith in Christ." A story is told of a head of a house, that he boasted to "have attended university sermons for upwards of fifty years, and he thanked God that he was still a Christian." Nor is there any reason to doubt this don's persuasion, that he did not disbelieve *a* Christianity. He had been brought up a member of the Church of England, and, therefore, only looked upon all heresy as a normal, if troublesome, frailty of the spiritual man.

The question, then, "What is the influence of Oxford on the minds of the vast variety of undergraduates?" is one that must be narrowed to their habits of religious thinking rather than to their conclusions as to faith. It may be said, generally, that the difference between a Catholic and a Protestant is that a Catholic conforms his habits of religious thinking to the teachings of the one infallible Church, whereas a Protestant conforms his habits of

religious thinking to the teachings of his own private eclecticism, thus making his eclecticism his (whole) habit of thought, criticising, not believing, being his principle. For example, when an Oxford undergraduate comes away from the university church, after listening (as in duty bound) to the university sermon, he proceeds to discuss the doctrines of the preacher, as he would discuss any new views on political economy, on science, or on some novelty of costume. Doctrines, themselves, he knows must be important, because Christianity, as a dispensation, is divine; but the particular opinions *on* doctrines which any preacher may advocate cannot possibly have any authority whatever. A doctrine is one thing, a view is another; and as the preacher can only give his own views, or his own approval of some other preacher's views, but has no authority to teach doctrine infallibly, the undergraduate can give also his views, which are quite as authoritative as were the preacher's. Put the undergraduate in the pulpit, and he would probably teach quite as reasonable a doctrine as the tutor, who is only a somewhat "older hand." But neither the undergraduate nor his tutor can teach Christianity, because neither has any authority but himself. This is not an imputation on the good faith of preachers, since preachers profess only to give their views; and the undergraduate takes the preacher at his own value. The undergraduate is himself proposing to become a clergyman; and he hears the preacher announce, as a postulate of Christianity, that God's true Church cannot teach truth infallibly, and that to believe in infallibility is to degrade human thought to a level with mechanical automata. To degrade God's truth to the level of human opinion is to lift up that human opinion; but to lift up human opinion to infallible truth is to degrade that same human opinion. It is a curious confusion. The undergraduate is perfectly certain that Christian doctrine is divine, because to doubt this would be to abandon Christianity. But he is equally certain that Oxford theology is human, because human opinions can judge it. Here, then, is the Oxford "habit of thinking." It is, as has been said, the conforming habits of thinking to the teaching of a private eclecticism, instead of conforming the habits of thinking to the teaching of infallible authority.

Mr. Bynne says that, if you see an undergraduate absorbed in his prayer-book, during the chapel performance of divine service, the chances are that he is "struggling with that farrago of nonsense, the article on predestination, or mastering the intricacies of the doctrine of original sin." So that our author does not believe much in the devotion of chapel-going, any more than in the authority of the "Thirty-Nine." And yet it is certain that he does believe in Anglicanism, in a sense which may be called "limited

liability." It is this principle of "limited liability" which permeates all Oxford—undergraduate life. Not only as to "faith," but as to all branches of study, the principle is "limited liability." "Oxford has the body of learning, but not the soul," says one of the essayists we are quoting. Another essayist says, when speaking of the vast range of "subjects," "There is one drop of the spirit of learning to cartloads of painfully acquired knowledge." Another says, "It is all industry now, not education." Mr. Bynne remarks that, "Teaching is now the fashion"—for teaching, perhaps, read professional lecturing—physical science, history, philosophy, philology, theology, scholarship, almost every branch of knowledge is taught—but on the principle of a limited liability. As to general literature, Mr. Bynne has an humble estimate of the interest which undergraduates ordinarily take in it. Indeed, he says that they know nothing of general literature. Doubtless this may be true as to the majority; but the explanation is that all their time is wanted for cramming, so that there is no time for the elegances of private reading. As to theology, it must seem absurd to so much as speak of it in connection with a Protestant university. No personal relations existing between the dons and the undergraduates, nor any ecclesiastical or priestly relations; the whole idea of theology being disputations on the groundwork, as well as on all the doctrines of Christianity, it must follow that theology proper can have no more place at Oxford than could wild Protestantism have in the Roman Propaganda. So that the whole idea of modern Oxford, even in the acceptance of accomplished Anglicans, would seem to be failure academically, and failure controversially and spiritually. Yet the dons are only partly to blame, because they are placed in a false position. They cannot teach if they have nothing to teach; and even if they had anything to teach, they have no divine authority to teach it. Tennyson, the poet, seems to have had Oxford dons in mind when he addressed some would-be teachers of great things, "You that do profess to teach, and teach us nothing; feeding not the heart."

III.

When the undergraduate has developed into the graduate, and the graduate into the reverend divine, there naturally comes the question, which it was proposed next to consider, "What is the influence of Oxford life on the religious opinions of those clergymen who have passed three years in preparing for the ministry?" And first, there is the education of Oxford, in the sense of the place, the surroundings. No man can live in a place of supreme beauty, a town full of exquisite ancient colleges, without imbibing some-

thing of the spirit of that beauty, of the lesson of the monuments of a great past. Who that has leaned over Magdalen Bridge, and looked up at Waynflete's witching tower ; or visited the Magdalen cloisters, or its grove, or its water-walks,—"delectable as the banks of Eurotas, where Apollo was wont to sing his lays,"—has failed to feel a reverence for those far off ages when architects were Christian poets ; when such men as William of Wykeham, and William of Sens, and all those wonderful idealists who built the English cathedrals, derived all their genius of instinct or intuition from the supernatural faith that was in them? Here is education for the soul. If a man cannot appreciate external Oxford, or derive improvement from the faith-lessons of its very stones, he had better retire from all hopes of education, save such as a parochial school may impart. Three years at Oxford mean three years of companionship with the most beautiful creations of Catholic times, and therefore necessarily three years of instruction in devotion, faith, art, and Christian chivalry. And there is something to be said too, even at the risk of a sort of paradox, in favor of the Protestantizing of Oxford. Just as when you enter an old cathedral, and see the barren uses, the barren services, with which poor Protestantism mocks the majesty of the ideal, you *learn* (unless you are incapable of learning) what an "abomination of desolation" Protestantism is ; so, when you reside at Oxford, the very contrast of the past and present is a sufficient witness to the divinity of the Catholic Church. A Catholic, when he goes to Oxford, interprets everything he sees around him as witnessing correlatively to two truths, the sublime beauty of the intellect of Catholicism, with the consequent feebleness of all heresy. Nor is it possible for a Protestant to help *feeling* the same two truths, though his prejudices explain away half their force. If he is a man of honest conscience, as well as of a refined intuition, the Protestantizing of Oxford will un-Protestantize *him*, by a process of perhaps unconscious education. If not "converted" at Oxford, he will take away with him into his after-life such deep memories of Catholic fact and fruit of faith as will render him more easy to be converted in the future. Now here we have, perhaps, the chief feature of that "influence" which Oxford life must bring to bear upon the clergy. The mere polemical chat or gossip of Oxford common rooms, or of the rooms of the more "theological" of the undergraduates, may be remembered only as a branch of social amenities, or as indicating the wayward nature of all Protestantism. But what *will* be remembered with profound homage will be the monuments of the Catholic faith, the speaking stones of the wondrous chapels of Catholic times, the meaning of the lady chapels no longer used, of the now empty niches for Catholic saints, of the richly built but neglected

Catholic sanctuaries, and therefore of the desecration by the Reformers.

But more than this; if we pass from the dead to the living there will have been an education, at least negatively (and that is something), in "the theological atmosphere of the University." Heresy must drive every man towards the Church, though it must rest with each man to be driven into it. Now heresy is nowhere to be better studied than at Oxford; its mental compass is nowhere to be better gauged. You have the teaching body – all men of education, and most of them reverend divines of high standing—so completely at issue with one another and with the whole past, that they might just as well be ordained weather-cocks as ordained scholars. The head of a house who leaned his back against a wall and asked in despair, "Can anybody tell me what Christianity *is?*" was a great teacher of truth had he only known it, for he proved the essential absurdity of Protestantism. True, the nonsense of a negative does not prove the truth of an affirmative, but it does prove—as in the case of this doctor of divinity—that *if* Christianity be divine, Protestantism must be necessarily *not* divine. That is something on the pathway to Q. E. D. And it is this "something" which every Oxford man has learned. The clergyman who looks back on his three years' residence, looks back on "a farrago of nonsense," not only as regards the Thirty-Nine Articles (which Mr. Bynne very aptly so designates), but as regards *all* the negative teaching of *all* the dons who have "smashed up Popery" so as to lecture on the débris. Now, a clergyman with this experience, when he comes to minister in Anglican churches, must have two quite living certainties within his memory; the one that the best of Oxford was its Catholicism, the other that the worst of Oxford was its Protestantism. But its Catholicism, he well knows, was confined to its monuments, to its eloquent fabrics, —the more eloquent, in one sense, for their desolation,—to its records, its traditions, its "has been"; in short, to its "death that still speaketh." The clergyman, therefore, knows that the present is to the past what the Protestant Abbey of Westminster, London, is to the Catholic Abbey of Edward the Confessor. True, materially, Protestants possess ancient Oxford, but they possess only the body without the soul, the chapels without their purpose of the adorable sacrifice, the sanctuaries without their confession of the divine presence, the charters without a pretence even of obeying them. All this is present to the clergyman's memory, and what "influence" can such memory have upon him? Just this, that it makes him love the ideal and feel an intellectual contempt for the actual. So much does he love the ideal, that he sets to work to make the actual something like it, dressing up his Angli-

can conventicle in imitation of those Catholic chapels which he knows (Oxford taught him) were real. Hence, Ritualism. The ideal and the real being both Catholic, but actual Anglicanism being the contrary of both, Ritualists have set to work to build up a new actual, *minus* the authority of the real ideal. It was a last despairing effort, and it has failed. It is no more possible to make the Church of England Catholic, than to make Dr. Benson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, go to confession to a Franciscan monk, and receive absolution for intending to *remain* the archbishop of heresy.

Yet how was it, it may be asked, that this modern "influence" of life at Oxford has only so recently been seen to be exercised in the clerical mind? Simply because the shock of the Reformation was so terrific that it took three centuries for the heirs of the Reformers to regain their senses. We have to remember that the Reformers literally smashed Christianity to atoms, leaving nothing but a devil's whirlwind of controversy to take the place of the still small voice of eternal truth. In order to justify such a revolution, it was necessary to represent the Catholic Church as the veriest sink of every abomination of iniquity; and this *was* done in the religious literature of England throughout the Tudor, Stuart and Guelph dynasties, up to 1845. What "influence" could Oxford have on an English mind so long as that mind was taught by every Anglican clergyman, as well as by every Anglican publication, that there was no evil, moral, doctrinal or disciplinal, domestic, social, national or political, which could not be traced to the father of lies, the Catholic Church? Even in these days the "delirium tremens" of rabid Protestantism afflicts some really amiable, excellent Englishmen. What "influence," then, could beautiful structures, reared by Catholics, have on minds so mortally poisoned by fierce traditions except the influence which a beautiful mosque or an Athenian temple would naturally have on every intelligent Protestant traveller? It was not until the Oxford movement suggested, timidly and almost fearfully, that there *might* be something good in the Catholic Church, that men began to look at Oxford colleges as rather seeming to bear out the new suggestion that the real and the ideal *might* be one.

Supposing our newly-ordained Anglican clergyman to have had access to the Oxford College libraries, he will have learned that it was customary, during eight centuries, to refer all academical disputes to the Supreme Pontiff, and this, too, both on secular and religious points. Mr. C. R. L. Fletcher, in his "Collectanea," gives some instances of such references to various pontiffs. Papal bulls were sent to more than one Archbishop of Canterbury, authorizing him to become visitor of the University; just as, on the other hand,

petitions were sent from the University, begging the Popes to provide benefices for poor masters. Envoys, on a variety of doubtful points, were constantly passing to and fro during the Middle Ages; the inter-communication of all universities with Rome being in those times simply a matter of course. Another fact, too, which our newly-ordained Anglican clergyman will have remarked in his study of the existing catalogues of the ancient libraries, is that theologians were never known to be controversial upon such doctrines as had been pronounced to be of faith, but only upon still undefined opinions. This will have struck him as being in contrast with his own time, when theology, so-called, is more combative on matters of faith than it is even on the lighter matters of opinion. And, thirdly, he will have noted, with surprise and with admiration, what exquisite care used to be taken, during the Catholic ages, to multiply perfect copies of the two Testaments; with what splendid industry and conscientiousness men devoted their whole lives to the critical task of making manuscript Bibles; and how carefully they guarded them, how magnificently they illumined them, what proofs they gave of "reverencing the Scriptures."

We need not pursue the subject; we should be led into so many comparisons that it would be difficult to know where to make a pause. Suffice it that we add that, in regard to the five books of which the titles were given in the beginning, Mr. Bynne's "Short Studies" seem to strike the right key—at least, negatively, though, perhaps naturally, not affirmatively. Mr. Andrew Lang's "Oxford" scarcely "catches the point"; it is conscientious, statistically—and, of course, it is well written, for Mr. Andrew Lang always writes well—but his mode of treatment hardly admits of fruitful comment. A great subject demands a big grasp; and it is impossible for any one who is not a Catholic to do justice to the University of Oxford. Still it is something that even the primary fact that Oxford *was* Catholic should be brought before the English mind by good writers. Readers will sometimes be led to draw their own conclusions from premises not insisted on by an author; so that, for example, Mr. Bynne's happy satire on modern Oxford may lead the way to the thinking more about ancient Oxford. That the majority of Anglican clergymen deplore the poverty of Modernism is seen in the fact that they try to imitate antiquity; Ritualism being the homage that Protestantism pays to the Church, not hypocritically but apologetically. Ritualism is the half-way house for such timid Church of England men as find the whole journey too long to be taken without rest. True, the half-way house is fitted up, in regard to furniture, so as to delude the travellers into the idea of being at home; yet a short term of resting in such an extemporized shelter must suffice to convince the

travellers that they must "go on." *Some* travellers, of course, will stop anywhere, asking only to be let alone and make the best of it. For example, the present Anglican Bishop of Salisbury, who must have "left Oxford" some forty years ago, has evidently decided that his official tenure of the episcopal office is preferable to the heritage of the Catholic faith. This bishop has recently told his "Diocesan Church Defence League" that Christian doctrine is only a matter "of fashion." He assured this interesting league that the Church of England had been the National Church, not only since England was a nation, "but, indeed, before England was a nation"; and then he added: "Like other ladies, the Church had been more or less under the influence of fashion; and when any one set of religious opinions was the prevalent fashion throughout the country, it was perfectly inevitable that the Church, as the great bulk of the nation, should more or less partake of those opinions. When the errors of the Church of Rome were dominating the whole civilized world, how could they be surprised that the Church of England was more or less under the influence of Popish corruptions and authority?" We quote these words from a Salisbury newspaper, which is largely circulated throughout the bishop's happy diocese. Here then is an example of a bishop, who was "an Oxford man," settling down in his maturity, both of years and of "views," as one who accepts heresy as "the fashion." He considers that when the founders of the Oxford colleges ordered that masses should be said in perpetuity for the repose of their own souls and of those of all Christians, they were simply "men of fashion," "like other ladies"; looking upon all Christian verities as precisely of the same value as bonnet-ribbons, or other caprices of "*la mode*." Certainly an "Oxford education" was utterly thrown away upon this good bishop. The "influence" of a three years' residence was to convince him that Catholic chivalry—the most beautiful devotion of the natural genius to the work of rearing superb monuments of Catholic charity, for the education of soul, mind, heart and imagination—was all an accident of the passing "fashion" of the supernatural, precisely as was the national custom of delighting in tournaments, in hawking, in cross-bows, or in wrestling. Can we wonder that when Oxford men, who have become Anglican bishops, look on the doctrines of the faith as "ladies' fashions," Oxford men who are only curates retain chiefly a keen memory of Oxford supper parties, "gateing," or "proctorizing?" "Influence!" All influence depends on the nature of the soil on which the culture of great examples is brought to bear. You cannot influence the unwilling, the mundane. Just as the undergraduate who is devoted wholly to his pleasures fails to read the lessons of the Catholic fabrics, so the bishop, who loves his com-

fortable, domestic palace, has no memory of the Catholic charters which were for all time. The general conclusion in regard to the two questions we have considered, the influence on undergraduates and the influence on clergymen of a three years' residence in once-Catholic Oxford, is that for men who look on religion as "the fashion," Paradise itself would be thrown away; but for the majority of Oxford men there is a profound, spiritual education, which bears fruit all their lives in thought and act.

THE IMMORAL TEACHING OF THE JESUITS.

Encyclopædia Britannica. A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and General Literature. 9th ed. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1881. Vol. xiii., article, "Jesuits," p. 645.

AS far back as the days of St. Paul, men were heard to raise the cry of warning against the immoral teaching of the Church. The enemies of the newly-founded society brought against her the serious charge that she sapped the foundations of morality by teaching that "It is lawful to do evil, that good may result from it." The Apostle, in his Epistle to the Romans, rejects the charge as a calumny, and declares the authors of it to be worthy of just condemnation. "As we are slandered, and as some affirm that we say, 'Let us do evil that there may come good'; whose damnation is just."—Rom. iii., 8.

Well might the Society of Jesus repeat the words of the Apostle. From the time of her foundation to the present day, the same false accusation, either from ignorance or malice, has been brought against her by her enemies. Not, indeed, that her adversaries had made her or her doctrine on morals the sole object of their attack. The Society has always had the proud honor of being able to point to her enemies as the enemies, not of the principle, for it often suited them, but of the faith which she labored to defend.

And so the late Rev. Dr. Littledale, of England, a man foremost among the modern slanderers of the Church, could not fail to single out as a special object of aspersion the immoral teaching of the Jesuits. In his article, entitled "Jesuits," in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and again in his letter of November 18, 1887, to the

Pall Mall Gazette, he assures the world that "the justification of means by ends" is a recognized doctrine of Jesuit theologians. He kindly acknowledges, however, that this charge is very odious in itself, and that it, therefore, needs proof. Still, the only proof which he adduces to convict hundreds of Catholic theologians of immoral teaching, consists of three *garbled* quotations from three *German* Jesuits. Dr. Littledale gives what he asserts to be the words of these writers, but somehow he forgets to give any reference to book or chapter, thus rendering the verification of his charge exceedingly difficult, if not impossible. Fair-minded Protestants are not wanting, who, like the writer in the Episcopalian *Guardian*, protest against the methods used by their English brother, and roundly condemn "his pretentious, prophetic oracularity, his audacity of self-assertion, and the immodesty with which he contemptuously expresses himself," etc.—*The Guardian*, New York, February 19, 1881.

These are hard words, but we may add, they are now in vain, as far as Dr. L. is personally concerned. He has been summoned to give an account of the "means" which he used to reach his "end," and we should be willing to let his record sleep with him in the dust. But "the evil that men do lives after them" in more senses than the one intended by the great dramatist. The Doctor's slanderous article on the Jesuits springs into new life with every new edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and in a few days we shall encounter it again in a new and cheap edition just being published in New York. The Doctor's assertion, respecting the teaching of the Society, is used as a kind of sacred text with which certain writers and preachers are wont to drive home their argument. Hardly a month passes, without some one coming forward with the old charge and clinching it with the *quotations* given by Dr. Littledale, and, during the present season, no doubt, some indefatigable pastor will arouse his summer audience from its noon-day dream by again exposing the infamous teaching of that wicked body—the Jesuits.

What, then, is the teaching of the Society of Jesus on the morality of human actions? The Society teaches that the moral character, the lawfulness or unlawfulness of man's deliberate action depends on three principles: the *end* which man proposes to himself, the *object* to which his action of its own nature tends, and the *circumstances* that accompany and qualify it. If any one of these three principles be wrong, the action is not, and cannot be morally good. Hence, it is not the *end alone*, which a man proposes to himself that gives his action its morality. Nor is there a writer of the Society who holds, or ever held, such an absurd opinion. They adopt the common axiom: *Bonum ex integra causa*

malum ex quocumque defectu. An action is morally good when its entire moral cause (the whole plea) is good; it is bad when in that cause there is any defect.

The *object* to which a deliberate action of its own nature tends makes the action intrinsically bad, or good, or indifferent. Thus, blasphemy is intrinsically wrong, because its object—to dishonor God—is morally bad. Almsgiving is intrinsically good, because its object—to relieve one's neighbor in his distress—is morally good. Walking, writing, etc., are *indifferent* actions, because their object in itself is morally neither good nor bad.

An action which is *objectively* wrong is always unlawful; no end can justify it, no circumstance redeem it, nor can any power make it allowable. It is always forbidden because it is always bad. But the same cannot be said with regard to the lawfulness of an action which is intrinsically good. Because a man is never allowed to do what is wrong, it does not follow that he is always allowed to do what is *objectively* right. Thus, he is not allowed to do for an *evil* purpose even a thing which is in itself good. Moreover, there may be circumstances in which a man would be morally wrong in doing from an upright motive what otherwise is objectively good. To give an alms, for instance, in order to promote the glory of God, is certainly an excellent work in itself, but to do so from another man's pocket is clearly unjustifiable. Again, it is admitted by every one that, for purposes of security or utility, human law may introduce some limitations of personal liberty. In this case, to do what is forbidden by the law is criminal and is morally wrong, simply because it is forbidden. Now, besides actions which in themselves are morally good or bad, there are actions which, by reason of their *object*, are morally neither good nor bad. Such actions as these depend for their moral character on the *circumstances* that qualify them, and on the *end* for which man performs them.

The *end* or *purpose* for which a man acts is some good to be attained; and that this good may be morally such, it must be according to right reason, and in no way opposed to any of the perfections found in God. The *end* is said to be the *chief* source from which the moral character of man's deliberate action is derived; for it is the *end* which immediately affects him as a rational being and directly moves him to act. Hence, in their treatises on "Human Acts," where the sources and fundamental principles of morality are laid down and vindicated, all the theologians of the Society teach that the right way of acting is first to know the *end* for which we act, and then ascertain what are the *lawful* means of reaching it. In this sense it may be properly said that "the end

determines the means," and that it is the end proposed by the agent that gives to his deliberate action its true moral character.

It seems clear, from what has already been stated, that the end or purpose for which one acts is not necessarily identical with the purpose or object *intrinsic* to the action. One man steals in order to pay his debts; another gives a munificent alms in order to gain notoriety. This *end*, which is *extrinsic* to the action, is the *end* of which there is question when it is asked: "Does the end justify the means?" The "end" is supposed to be morally good and the "means" to be morally bad, for they need to be "justified." The meaning of the question, therefore, under discussion is simply this: "Is an action, which is morally bad in itself or in its circumstances, made morally good by the moral goodness of the end which a man may propose to himself in acting?" How do the theologians of the Society answer this question? "They all answer it in the affirmative," replies Dr. Littledale; "this is the recognized doctrine of the Society." If so, the "recognized theologians" of the Society must teach it. No man of sense could call a doctrine "the recognized doctrine" of a Society if the authorized teachers of that body do not teach that doctrine. What, then, if they explicitly and emphatically reject it? Now this is exactly the case. Not to exceed the limits kindly allowed me by the editor, I will quote from only a few of the leading Jesuit theologians, but these few will represent the teaching of the Society in every part of the world.

The first witness will be Suarez, a Spaniard, for many years professor in the universities of Salamanca and Rome. "Although a man," he says, "chooses *evil* means for a *good* end, his choice is *evil* . . . . the act of choosing does not receive its moral goodness from the *end* as existing in itself, but from the *choosing* or *ordering of means* to the end. And although the *end* in itself be good, still the employing of *bad* means for a *good* end is not good, nor is it conformable to reason; and on this account the act has no moral goodness."—*De bonitate et malitia actuum humanorum.* Disp. viii., Sec. 2, n. 26.

Cardinal Bellarmine, an Italian, is well known as perhaps the best controversial writer of the Society. In his "Dottrina Cristiana," he asks: Is it lawful to tell a lie for a good end? and answers: "No, for a lie being truly a sin, no reason or motive can justify it."—Dich. 8, Comm. Edit. Naples, 1862, p. 187. The great Belgian professor, Fr. Lessius, is not less explicit on this point. In his famous work "*De Jure et Justitia*," published in 1632, he puts down as a first principle, "What is in itself evil does not become lawful by the fact of its being referred to a good end."—l. ii., c. 9, d. 7.

Gury, a French Jesuit, whose work on moral theology has been for many years the standard text-book of the students of the Society, lays down the principle in almost the same words: "It is never lawful to do evil, no matter how trivial, in order to obtain a good, whatever that good may be. For according to the well-known axiom derived from the Apostle, 'evil is not to be done that there may come good.' Thus it would not be lawful for you to tell a lie in order to save the life of a man."—Comp. Theol. Moral, Gury-Ballerini, vol. i., c. 2, n. 9, Rome, 1874.

Layman, one of "the leading German theologians" of the Society, though quoted by Dr. Littledale as teaching the immoral doctrine, states in clear and express words "the recognized doctrine" of his Order: "The fact of a *good end* does not make good an action which is in itself evil, but leaves it simply and entirely so."—Theol. Moral, B. I., Treatise II., c. 9, n. 7. Before reaching the *fourth* treatise of Book the First, from which, as we shall see, Dr. Littledale quotes, Layman must have forgotten what he had laid down in the *second* treatise of the same book. Somebody blundered, Layman or Littledale? Which of the two it was, we shall see later on.

Lehmkuhl, the last but not the least of the German Jesuit moralists, states the same doctrine with his usual thoroughness and exactness.—Cf. *De Act. Humanis*, ch. iii., sec. 2, n. 4. Fr. Jones, of St. Beuno's College, England, who has spent many years of his life in teaching moral theology, and has a right to be heard for his authority, adds his evidence in the following words: "There is nothing more abhorrent or contrary to Catholic teaching and the opinions of theologians than that the end justifies the means, or that evil may be done for a good end."—Dishonest Criticism, Hodges, London, 1887, p. 51.

Nor is the doctrine of the Society in America in any way at variance with what is taught by the Society in the Old World. Father Sabetti, for the last seventeen years professor of moral theology in the Jesuit Seminary at Woodstock, Md., in his popular and scholarly abridgment of "Gury's Moral Theology," over and over again applies the principle, "It is never allowed to obtain an end, however good, by unlawful means."—Comp. Theol. Moral. Pustet, N. Y. *Editio altera*, pp. 6, 104, 132, etc. Father Hill of the Jesuit University of St. Louis, Missouri, in his "Moral Philosophy," has two very able articles (first and second of chapter iii.) on "the principles of moral goodness," and in both of them he repudiates the immoral maxim "advocated," according to Dr. Littledale, "as the recognized doctrine of the Society."

But if the theologians of the Society in Europe and America reject the odious maxim, perhaps Jesuit writers in far-off countries

consider themselves secure in spreading the baneful doctrine! To the above quotations, then, I may be allowed to add two more. One represents the teaching of the Society in China, the other in India. Fr. A. Sica, professor of moral theology in China, in his very interesting work "*Casus Conscientiæ*," written for the use of Chinese missionaries, and published in Zi-ka-Wei, 1881 (p. 12, Casus iii.), asks, "whether it would be lawful for a missionary to take away a child from its heathen parents in order to baptize it and have it brought up in the Christian faith?" He answers, that "this way of acting is unlawful, for it contains a clear act of injustice, and evil is not to be done for a good cause." He states the same principle again in Appendix II., Casus VI., p. 29.

Fr. T. A. Gallo, an Indian missionary and the author of a work on "Moral Theology," written for the use of his brethren in the Madura mission, solves many questions by applying the same principle, that "the end does *not* justify the means." Thus to the question whether it would be lawful for a man under the influence of sorcery (in which the demon is supposed to play a part), to make use of sorcery as a means to bring about his cure; Fr. Gallo answers in the negative, saying: "It is never allowed to do what is intrinsically bad."—*Suppetitiæ Evangelii Præconibus*, Rome, 1857. vol. ii., p. 142.

We have quoted sufficient authorities to show the rashness and utter falsehood of Dr. Littledale's statement in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and have made it clear, we think, that the immoral doctrine contained in the maxim—"The end justifies the means," far from being "the recognized doctrine of the Jesuits," is everywhere rejected by the Society through her recognized theologians, and is never mentioned in any of their books except to be refuted.

We are almost forced into the belief that Dr. Littledale based his slanderous charge on no other foundation than the bitter prejudice he entertained against the Society, and doubtless against the Church whose theologians he attacked. However, to excuse him from a wilful violation of the commandment which says: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," we are bound to suppose that he had never read "the leading theologians of the Society." Of course he must have read at least Layman, Busembaum and Wagemann, the three theologians from whom he takes his quotations! But let us see how. He quotes Layman as saying: "Cui concessus est finis concessa sunt media ad finem *ordinata*"—"To whom the end is allowed, to him also are allowed the means *suited* to that end." After a careful examination of Layman's two volumes in folio, of the Wurzburg edition, 1748, we have found the only passage to which Dr. Littlefield could possibly have referred, and the text is *garbled* in the pretended quotation.

The words of Layman are: "Cui concessus est finishuic etiam media ad finem *necessaria* concessa sunt"—"To whom the end is allowed, to him also are allowed the means *necessary* for that end."—Treatise IV.; B. 1, chap. 15, p. 102. Instead of the all-important word "*necessary*," Dr. Littledale by some slip of the pen has dropped in the word "*suited*." The word must have been "suited" to the end which the doctor had in view; and this defender of public morality was not slow to shape his conduct on a moral principle which he had just denounced as infamous.

Unlawful means may be *suited* to attain a good end, but they are never *necessary* means to that end, and therefore they are never allowed. This is what Layman explicitly teaches in the passage quoted above. "The fact of being directed towards a good end," he says, "does not make good an action which is in itself evil, but leaves it simply and entirely evil . . . . and therefore it would be sinful to tell a lie in order to help your neighbor, as it would be likewise wrong to steal from a rich man in order to give an alms to the poor." The principle so explicitly stated by Layman is sanctioned by every law, and taught by every moralist. Its meaning, as Father Jones very well says (l. c. p. 47), is that "each lawful end has assigned means for its attainment, and that these means are shown by right reason to be fitted to the end, and as such are lawful if they are honestly available." Let me give a practical application of this principle. It is allowed by all law, both human and divine, to repel under certain conditions force by force, nay to slay the assassin who unjustly seeks to take away our life. But one of the conditions required is that the killing of the assassin be a *necessary means* for self-preservation. Kent in his "Commentaries on American Law" (Part IV., Lecture 24), teaches that "homicide is justifiable in every case in which *it is rendered necessary* in self-defence against the person who comes to commit a known felony with force against one's person, etc. The right of self-defence in these cases is founded on the law of nature." Would Dr. Littledale or any sensible person charge our American Law, and in fact the law of every nation, nay the law of nature, with teaching that "the end justifies the means?" It is only as embodied in this case, that the principle is held by Layman and the other Jesuit theologians. Are the *necessary* means, which are allowed by nature or rather by the Author of nature for the attainment of a *lawful* end, *lawful* means or not? *A priori* such means must needs be lawful, and right reason shows them to be so. In the case proposed the *necessary* means, or the killing of an unjust aggressor, is not an act of injustice; for the assassin by the injustice of his aggression forfeits his right to immunity from the physical force employed to resist him.

Hence Busenbaum, another "leading theologian of the Society,"

quoted by Dr. Littledale as teaching the immoral doctrine, "*cui licitus est finis licita sunt media*," in the very place where the words quoted by the Doctor are found, is speaking of means which of their own nature are lawful, for he expressly declares that these means must be "free from violence and injustice "("præcisa vi et injustitia.")—B. iv., c. 3, d. 7, a 2. Dr. Littledale gives only the sentence quoted above, leaving out the words which immediately precede and which explain the nature of the means allowed. Had the Doctor carefully read his Busembaum, he would have found that the Jesuit clearly disowns the immoral maxim, so unjustly imputed to him. Thus, in the explanation of the commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," Busembaum proposes the question, "Whether it would be lawful, in order to avoid grievous torments, to accuse another of crime?" and he answers, by saying, "To do so, would be unlawful, if the accusation were false, for in that case your action would be a pernicious lie,"—B. iii., Tract vi., c. 1, or in other words: "It is not allowed to do evil that there may come good."

The words of Wagemann, in his "Synopsis Theol. Moralis," as quoted by the Doctor, "Finis determinat probitatem actus," "The end determines the goodness of an action," taken in their context, simply express the common doctrine of all theologians. Wagemann is speaking of actions which, of themselves, are *indifferent*, and such actions evidently depend for their moral goodness on the moral goodness of the *end* intended by man. In this sense, it may be said that "the end justifies the means." But, taken in this sense, no one ever called the principle in question.—Oeniponti, 1765, Edit. 2d, Pars 1st.

Dr. Littledale's dishonest methods are a fair instance of that nice morality which has characterized the efforts of our adversaries to establish this and similar charges against Catholic teaching. Wholly incapable of imagining, not to say comprehending, the perfect system of arrangement and the rigorous accuracy of language used by the schoolmen, these self-made champions of morality have fabricated charges which have not even the shadow of a basis to stand on. To give their accusations some show of plausibility, they have had to tamper with the text or grossly misrepresent the author's meaning. Sheer ignorance would be a poor palliation of such conduct, and the conviction is forced upon one that writers, like Dr. Littledale, make playthings of the minds of men. They trifle with human weakness and have recourse to the old device: "Cry it loud, my masters, and cry it often; there must always be some who cannot, and some who will not, investigate the truth of your assertions."

THE FORCE OF PRINCIPLES.

A PRINCIPLE may be widely taken to signify "that from which anything proceeds." It may be in the ontological, logical or moral order, speculative or practical. The force of principles, like every other force, is measured by its effects. In his argument with Callicles, Socrates hesitates not to use "*σιδήρεοις καὶ ἀδαμαντίνοις λογόις*" (iron and adamantine words or reasons) to express the force with which his conclusions were bound to his principles. He intimates that not all the adroitness of all the Sophists could remove the conclusions, so long as the principles were allowed to stand.

This is what takes place in every formal syllogism. If the premises are admitted, the conclusion necessarily follows. Hence the importance, in every instance, of making sure of the principles before attempting to reason from them, and the error of those who would limit the domain of logic to mere forms of deduction. For since the end of logic is to direct the mind to the attainment of truth, he that sets out from uncertain or doubtful principles, must not expect to reach certainty in his conclusions. There may possibly be a true conclusion from a false principle, but only at the sacrifice of consistency in the process; just as, by like inconsistency, a person, starting from true principles, may arrive at false conclusions. But, in this case, the conclusion is not derived from the principles or premises. For falsity cannot be derived from truth, nor truth from falsity. "There is no good tree that bringeth forth evil fruit, nor an evil tree that bringeth forth good fruit."

Criteriology, or that part of logic which treats of the sources and foundations of certainty, is of paramount importance to all who value truth more than the search after it. A less quantity of certain knowledge is worth far more than a large amount of uncertain or doubtful knowledge, if, indeed, this can be called knowledge at all.

Two very common mistakes must be avoided: (1) That of reasoning closely from uncertain data or principles, and then claiming certainty for the conclusion; (2) That of taking certain acknowledged facts, and from them undertaking to prove the existence of a certain principle, on the ground that if the principle were established, the facts would follow.

This latter is the most specious, and withal the most insidious, form that sophistry is wont to assume. If the principle, A, were established, the facts, B, C, D, would follow, or be accounted for.

But these facts are established; therefore, the principle is also established. If all the different species of animals and vegetables were derived by evolution from one original form, with a constant tendency to improve upward, there would be found a close connection between them, and a very obvious family likeness between any two contiguous species. But there is a wonderful linking together in the whole chain of being from mere earth to the highest form of life, the highest members of a lower species coming very close to the lowest members of the next higher species, in regular gradation throughout the whole scale of created being. The evolutionist takes these facts as evidence of the truth of his system, of the superfluousness of a Creator, and the natural development of all varieties of things. St. Thomas finds in them proof of the magnificence and grandeur of creation, and the consequent surpassing bounty and riches and power and glory of the Creator.

Even if evolution were proved possible, which it is not and can not be, since no man could live thousands of years, to make the experiment, still it would require positive proof that it had done what is claimed for it, before reason could accept it. And this, even if there were no positive proof, as there is, of a direct creation to account for the existence and variety of things, but only of the possibility of a creation. Under this hypothesis we could only say that evolution is possible, but this we cannot actually say.

Another instance. If the metal, A, enters into the composition of the sun, it will give forth the phenomenon, B, as a sign of its presence. But the phenomenon, B, does appear; therefore, the metal, A, is one of the constituents of the sun. Here are two unwarranted assumptions: (1) That, from knowing the phenomenon produced by A, under experiment in our laboratory, we would know it also if A were acting naturally in the sun. For the conditions in the two cases may be very widely different—greater intensity of heat, etc.—which are past our finding out with any degree of accuracy at such an immense distance; (2) Even if we did know that the said phenomenon could be produced by the said metal in the sun, we should first have to know that no other constitution of the sun could produce that metal, ere we could reasonably affirm that B was produced by A. And this we cannot know, without our knowing more than any savant has yet known of the nature and origin and action of light.

The force of principles is not confined to true principles. False ones are just as uncompromising. Both have only to be followed with logical exactness, and the result in one case will as surely be falsity as it will be truth in the other. When Kant laid down the false principle that our ideas are wholly subjective; that they are *a priori* necessary forms of the mind, neither derived from nor rep-

resentative of objective realities, he opened the door to all the vagaries of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel. For, having taught that "space is an *a priori* intuition, found in us antecedently to all perception of external objects and as the formal quality of the mind, in virtue of which we are affected by objects, or as to the form of external sensation in general,"[1] he enabled Fichte to reason logically from his master's principles to the conclusion that there is nothing in space but *ego*, who furnished the *ideas* of what *seemed* to be there. For, if Kant was right in maintaining that we must needs have the idea of space, though there is no such objective reality, why may it, must it, not be that we are necessitated to have the ideas of all the objects we think are in space, though, in truth, there are no such objects there? There is only the *ego;* all else are creations of the *ego* by thinking them—baseless fabrics of mental vision.

Hegel could go a step farther, on the strength of the same principles laid down by his teachers. For, if all that exists is the *ego*, and the necessary mental forms (ideas) of the *ego* are in perpetual change, like cloud-shadows chasing one another over hill and dale, how can we predicate the existence even of the *ego?* There is nothing definite; all is in endless flux, in τὼ *fieri*, a *becoming*, a stretching out toward the absolute, and that, too, is *ideal.* Hegel transcends transcendentalism itself when he maintains that being and not being, entity and nonentity, are identical, thus doing away with the principle of contradiction. It is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be at the same time.

Let us, however, give credit to whom credit is due, and award to Fichte and Hegel a heroic disregard of logical consistency, at the personal expense of remaining the ridicule of reasoning generations yet unborn. Kant stopped short in his deductions from his principles, when he turned to the practical or ethical side of life, and, to save an apparent consistency, he invented two reasons for man: one, theoretical; the other, practical, as though different faculties calculated the truth of a mathematical theorem and estimated the moral rectitude of an action! Contradictions are still the outcome of error, no matter how far the process is carried—contradiction with one's self or with the sound common sense of mankind.

Sir William Hamilton affords another instance of contradiction between a man's theorizing and his practice. For surely no one would think of charging him with not worshiping God, however far he was from the true religion; and yet strict adherence to his philosophic principles would preclude the possibility of such wor-

[1] See Ueberweg's *History of Philosophy*, vol. ii., p. 165.

ship. Teaching that the infinite, or unconditioned, as he preferred to call it, is unknowable, he taught that God is unknowable. But we cannot love what we cannot know, and we cannot worship what we cannot love. So that, to be consistent, he ought either to renounce his philosophy or abandon the worship of God.

This latter conclusion is just that which the more logical but atheistical Agnostics have reached, adding their own peculiar tenet (whence or how derived we will not stop to inquire), that this unknowable is a supreme force, an impersonal God. But an impersonal God is no God. Wanting intelligence, God would be less than the lowest of the human race, and to say that such a being could be a supreme anything is an insult to common sense, a mockery of reason. Supreme Force! Force cannot exist without something that has the force. This is atheism pure and simple, and it is unreasonable to look for wisdom or sound, consistent thought in an atheist.

Spinoza laid down for himself a false principle in his definition of substance, which he maintained is "that which is in itself and to be conceived by itself;" in other words it is that the concept of which does not require the concept of anything else. From this principle followed Pantheism, at once. Nor did Spinoza leave to his followers, as Kant and Sir William Hamilton did to theirs, to deduce in full measure the consequences virtually contained in his principle. They could hardly excel him in logical acumen or in courage to apply it to its utmost extent. His reasoning was straightforward with mathematical precision from falsity to falsity. His false definition could apply to only one substance, and that is God, the absolute and infinite Being. There is then no other substance than God. All the rest, all finite beings, all creatures, are but *modes* or *modifications* of the essential attributes of this one divine substance. God, as absolute cause of all being, is *natura naturans*. The two essential attributes of God are infinite extension and infinite thought.

But to speak of infinite extension is like speaking of an infinite finite. For extension belongs only to bodies. And no body can be infinite, since every body is made up of parts, and parts can be numbered, and no number can be infinite, for every number can be increased or diminished by unity.

But it is in religion especially that we see the force of principles. Luther laid down principles the full force of which are seen only in our own day. He was so given to contradictions that he spared not even himself. Inconsistency, one is tempted to exclaim, thy name is Luther! He maintained that "Holy Writ (the Bible) is the sole fountain-head, standard, and judge in matters of faith."[1]

[1] "Credimus, confitemur, et docemus, unicam regulam et normam, ex qua omnia

He appealed to inerrable Scripture, and then put his own *private judgment* above the Scripture, admitting no other rule of its interpretation. He taught that each one's own private judgment in interpreting the Scripture is the rule of faith, and still continued to teach with authority, and that too after setting aside the authority established from the beginning of Christianity by the Founder of Christianity. *Faith alone*, he maintained, independently of good works, suffices for salvation; and because the Epistle of St. James contradicts this doctrine of Martin Luther, he called it "an epistle of straw." Woe to the passage of Scripture that does not harmonize with Luther's judgment! When it suited the exigency of his case he added to the Scripture with the same facility that he took from it.

But enough about the conflict of principles. Our object is to show their force. This is manifested by consistently following them to their logical conclusions. When Luther assigned to each one his own private judgment as the court of last appeal in interpreting the Scripture, and made Scripture the sole depository of the revealed word of God, he made all the *variations* set forth by Bossuet not only possible but perfectly legitimate. There was no need of King James's version, nor of the "Revised Edition." Each one had only to interpret the old edition with true Gospel liberty, keep as much as suited him, insert a word or two here and there to give the proper turn to what he chose to retain, and thus find light, and strength, and consolation in all his ways.

Luther himself was the first to demonstrate the force of his principle of *private judgment*, though he left it to his followers to show the ever-increasing intensity of that force. He says, speaking of the Pentateuch:

"We have no wish to see or hear Moses. Let us leave Moses to the Jews, to whom he was given as a *Mirror of Saxony;* he has nothing in common with Pagans and Christians, and we should take no notice of him. . . . . Moses is the prince and exemplar of all executioners. In striking terror into the hearts of men, in inflicting torture, and in tyrannizing, he is without a rival."

If the principle of *private judgment* had thus at its birth force enough to throw Moses in the shade, we need not wonder at seeing it annihilate him in our own day and putting Darwin and Spencer in his place, substituting evolution for creation. Even Ingersoll is only a little more daring than Luther, in that he blasphemously attributes to the Creator the tyranny and cruelty attributed by Luther to His accredited representative.

---

dogmata, omnesque doctores judicare oporteat, nullam omnino aliam esse, quam prophetica, et Apostolica, tum veteris tum novi Testamenti Scripta."—*Solid. Declar.* p. 605.

Luther says of Ecclesiastes: "This book should be more complete; it is mutilated; it is like a cavalier riding without boots or spurs; just as I used to do while I was still a monk." He calls the Book of Judith "a tragedy;" Tobias "a comedy" containing "many amusing and silly stories." He thinks the author of Ecclesiasticus "is not a prophet, and knows simply nothing of Christ;" and in this style judges the Second Macchabees: "I have," says Luther, "so great an aversion to this book and that of Esther, that I almost wish they did not exist; they are full of observances which are characteristically Jewish and Pagan abominations." Of the Gospels he says "that of St. John is the only sympathetic, the only true Gospel." He declares that "the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Paul are superior to the first three Gospels." In the Epistle to the Hebrews he finds "bits of wood, hay, and straw," and in that of St. James "absolutely nothing to remind one of the style of the Gospel." He declares that "there are many things objectionable in this book" (the Apocalypse), that "every one may form his own judgment of this book; as for myself, I feel an aversion to it, and to me this is a sufficient reason for rejecting it." (See "Alzog's Church History," vol. iii., p. 39, Translation.)

Thus far ventured Luther's private judgment in Biblical exegesis. "Friends of Enlightenment" followed, and in the name of philology, historical criticism, and rationalism, demonstrated anew the force of this principle by carrying it to farther conclusions. David Strauss pronounced the historical narrative of the New Testament a collection of *myths*. In his "Christology" he coincides with Philo the Jew in representing Christ and the *Logos* as mankind. A party known as *Young Germany*, following their private judgment, adopted pantheism, rejected the spirituality of Christianity, and advocated the complete emancipation of the passions from all restraint. Another school of the disciples of Hegel, by reason of the same principle, asserted that "the office of the Protestant Church was to destroy faith in the Christianity of the Gospel; that Luther was the forerunner of Hegel, who was immeasurably the superior of the Great Reformer; and that Protestantism, discarding methods of moral discipline and in alliance with *science and culture*, could continue to exist without the Bible, which is, after all, only a bundle of grotesque errors of every sort, sometimes affecting the most vital questions, and should, therefore, be cast aside as antiquated and misleading." [1]

Dr. Paulus's private judgment led him to explain away all miracles. All the known rules of hermeneutics were condensed

[1] See Alzog's *Church History:* Translation by Pabisch & Byrne; vol. iii., p. 974.

into Semler's "absolute freedom in the interpretation of Holy Scriptures." Ritter von Bunsen's private judgment had force enough to subordinate the "reinstated higher criticism," and his wealth of philological learning was equal to the herculean task of harmonizing Biblical facts with modern ideas. Ullman's private judgment went in for a *compromise* between the conflicting parties, schools, and sects; a heroic undertaking, indeed. But the private judgment of Schwarz broke down Ullman's exegetics completely, designating his system as "a dishonest super-rationalism," and its advocates eclectics, "destitute alike of ability and courage to form a new school," and, while accepting the general principle of miracles, still getting rid of them one by one in detail.

Neander's private judgment gave birth to his *Pectoral Theology* (*Pectus est quod theologum facit*), to a reply to Strauss, in which he professed to believe while he freely criticised, and to his *History of the Church*, in which supernatural facts are treated as so many anecdotes. Rothe's private judgment gave special prominence to the theory of "Unconscious Christianity." The private judgment of Baur found out that the books of the New Testament were only a part of the popular literature of the 1st and 2d centuries, and that "Christianity is a religion of purely human origin." Schenkel's private judgment "declared that the Protestant Church has no need of *priests*, that the *church of the people*, as at present constituted, recognizes no distinction between clergymen and laymen;"[1] while the private judgment of the Ritualists asserts the distinction at least of splendid vestments and other outward adornments. Explaining the miracle at the wedding of Cana, Schenkel said that "Jesus, by the influence of his presence, changed the water of trivial and ordinary conversation *into the wine of* elevated and glowing speech."

Private judgment went on with irresistible force till Claus Harms could say, "I could write on the nail of my thumb all the positive doctrines that are still believed." He invoked Luther's vengeance on those whose private judgment favored the *alliance* proposed by the *public* judgment of Prussia *between the Lutheran* and *Reformed Churches*. "Beware," said he, "of consummating this contract over the tomb where repose the bones of Luther. If you do, he may come to life again, and then woe to you." It appears, however that Luther did not reappear.

A new school was now issuing from private judgment, whose aim was stated to be "a return from Rationalism to primitive orthodox theology, a going out from the desert of liberal philosophy into the promised land of the Reformation."[2] The exodus had

[1] *Alzog*, vol. iii., p. 982.

[2] *Alzog*, "Universal Church History" (translation), vol. iii., p. 985.

hardly begun, however, when another private judgment, Pharaoh-like, started after them an opposition "orthodox" party, known as the *Neo-orthodox* school, which advocated, above and before all, a *State religion and a State theology*. They were rightly called Neo-Lutherans, for their private judgments were renewed with every new ruler. Hengstenberg took a leading part in this school, and branded as a true heretic every one whose private judgment differed from his own, thus disowning the fundamental principle of orthodox Protestantism. To complete the Prussian Evangelical Union, he taught that the "difference between the teachings of Luther and those of Calvin on the Lord's Supper are of no consequence; a confession of faith and theology is always sure to bring its own punishment. . . . . What God has joined ought not to be put asunder." [1]

Baumgarten's private judgment, in the name of a newer school, demanded that "*modern theology* should be subjected to fewer restraints, and that there should be a more unfettered application of the fundamental Protestant principle of *free inquiry*." Baumgarten had been a disciple of Hengstenberg, but had gone over to Hofmann, of whom Hengstenberg says: "This man, with a hardihood quite unusual among theologians, has dared to raise doubts concerning the authenticity, credibility, and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and to assail the Lutheran doctrine of the Trinity and the Last Supper. If one like him, who, smarting under disappointment, has gathered from the refuse of Rationalism what he fancied to be sound doctrine, can make converts *among us*, then is our cause certainly hopeless." [2]

This summary view of the workings of private judgment in the land of its birth, may serve to show the force of principles in general. We could point to like results, from the same principle, in Denmark, Sweden, Holland, and other countries, producing a Renan in France, a Colenzo in England; now a broad church, and then a narrow church; at one time anathematizing the Mass as damnable idolatry, again mimicking all its externals, and, from adopting a certain style of adornment, calling itself "Catholic." But we must look nearer home.

The most truly Protestant of all the private judgments, thus far delivered, is undoubtedly that given in the form of "A Protest against Dogma," by Amos K. Fiske, in the March number of the *Forum*. He is anxious about the temple of religious faith, thinks it "too valuable a thing to the human race to be allowed to get so out of plumb as to be in danger of collapse, and it behooves its guardians to find out whether it rests on rotting piles or on the

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 987.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 988.

eternal rock." This is sensible, especially in view of the divine promise, "Seek and you shall find," and the fact that the rock-built Church is luminous with four conspicuous and unmistakable marks—Unity, Catholicity, Sanctity, and Apostolicity.

Speaking of the danger to the Christian Church at the present day, "from the batteries of relentless questioning," Mr. Fiske says: "The assailants of the Church have contended that it rests upon creeds and dogmas as its sole foundation, and when these are battered down it must collapse"; he then asks: "But are not the real foundations deeper and more solid, and as enduring as the qualities and needs of humanity; and have not creeds and dogmas been the embankments and props accumulated for support in ages of imperfect knowledge and prevailing superstition? May not the modern revelations of science and reason show these to be unnecessary, and by clearing away the *débris* of a dark past, leave the fabric of a religion and a Church firmly resting on the original corner-stone, but with foundations broadened and solidified so as to be unassailable, and a superstructure in harmony with the intellectual progress of the race in these times?"

Here surely is a case to test the strength of private judgment. Sampson could shake the massive pillars to their fall, Milo of Crotona, they tell us, held up the roof when the tottering columns gave way, till Pythagoras and his disciples had time to escape; but now private judgment, more powerful than either, intends to uphold the "temple of religious faith" by removing its foundations,—"creeds and dogmas." The protester puts there something "deeper and more solid." What is this something? Private judgment, free opinion, of course. If creeds and dogmas are gone, there can be nothing else. This alone can be "as enduring as the qualities and needs of humanity." For is not one of these qualities freedom? And what is so free as private judgment—every man to think as he likes, and, of course, to speak and to act as he likes. What is so "unassailable?" If there is nothing left to assail but private judgment, it can be assailed by nothing else than private judgment; so that whichever side prevails, victory is sure to be on the side of private judgment. And what again is more "in harmony with the intellectual progress of the race in these times?" For is not private judgment wiser than divine revelation, more infallible than inspiration, more orthodox than the Apostles, more authoritative than all the Fathers, Doctors, Councils and Popes together? If private judgment is greater than all else, and "the race in these times" having emerged from "a dark past," is the greatest in advancement that has yet been, how can these two not be in the greatest harmony? This "Protest against Dogma" is therefore the greatest achievement yet made by Protestantism. Indeed, it

is impossible to surpass it. For there is nothing positive left to protest against. What remains is a blank negation. But a total negation is a total nothing, a nonentity. Therefore, there is nothing left of Protestantism by this protest. It is annihilated. It has completed the suicide long ago begun.

What is a church without dogma? There is nothing in it to teach, and consequently nothing to learn. With nothing to teach there can be no teachers; without teachers there can be no learners. A church without either teachers or learners, neither *docens* nor *discens*, is the newest, and therefore the most progressive thing yet devised; worthy of the "intellectual progress of the race in these times"; and worthy, too, of the principle to which it is due—private judgment. Every one in this church is perfect, for he cannot be taught, there being no dogma to teach him, and of course he has no need to be taught, and therefore is perfect.

What is a church without a creed? No one believes, for there is nothing to believe. If there is nothing to believe, there is no faith. Hence all must be seen, since "Faith is the evidence of things that appear not." If all is seen there is no hereafter, no heaven, no hell, no angel, no devil, no God. If there is only the present, then let the present be enjoyed. Let everybody think as he likes, speak as he likes, act as he likes. What *each one judges* best *is* best. Who grasps most of present enjoyments and present gratifications is wisest, happiest, best. Behold the *millennium* of private judgment!

Nor is this a vain conceit of the writer of "A Protest Against Dogma"; he seems to think that he has more than sufficient reason for anticipating its immediate advent. "Is it not a noticeable sign," he asks, "that intellectual and educated ministers have almost ceased to preach the doctrines of their theology?" And he subjoins the reason: "That is partly because they have ceased to believe them, and more, perhaps, because they know that intelligent and educated people in the pews do not believe them."

A curious question suggests itself here. Did unbelief in the pulpit produce unbelief in the pews, or did it work its way from pews to pulpit? Or did it originate simultaneously in both? The answer is left to each one's private judgment. Perhaps it is better to "judge not before the time." One thing seems certain, that the preaching of doctrines (dogmas) has ceased, because they are no longer believed either by preachers or hearers that are "intelligent and educated."

Here is another revelation. "We see ministers of the Gospel who cannot resist the influence of modern thought, retaining their places by steering clear of dogmatic avowals, and cherishing views which they dare not announce publicly." Heroic courage! "They

take the safe course of preaching a lofty morality and indulging in fine speculations upon human destiny." Consummate prudence! "But the incubus of creed is upon them and upon their congregations." How opportune this "Protest Against Dogma!" "Intelligent men compromise with conscience by acquiescing, for the sake of the good associations and good influences of the Church, in what they do not believe." How extremely conscientious they are! "Men of strong sense and good consciences admit that they adhere to the Church, not because they accept its dogmas, but for the sake of its good influences upon their families and society."

How can there be conscience, it may be asked, where there is no dogma? If private judgment is always right, and if it be true that "many men are of many minds," there can be no standard, and consequently no conscience. What is right to-day may be wrong to-morrow; nay, may be wrong to-day even. For A's private judgment may make something right, B's may make the same thing wrong, while C's may make it neither right nor wrong, but indifferent. Hence the same thing can be both right and wrong at once, and at the same time neither right nor wrong. This is the logical outcome of private judgment. Behold the *force of principle!* Q. E. D.

"Does it not cultivate," asks Mr. Fiske, "an insidious hypocrisy in pulpit and pew, which is fatal to a genuine zeal for the elevation of mankind—the great work of any vital religion, and in particular the work to which the Christian Church professes to be dedicated?" Answer. It does. And the sooner Protestantism goes the full length of the "protest against dogma," and professes unbelief or infidelity, the more honest it will be and the more consistent with its principle of private judgment.

A further revelation from this "protester against dogma," is that "Satan and his angels, who were imported from the mythology of Persia, have been banished to the same limbo with Zeus and the lesser Olympian gods. As common sense, armed with the shafts of science and reason, dispels the mists of superstition (creeds and dogmas), the myths and marvels with which it was peopled by the imagination vanish forever." This means that when unbelief and private judgment have taken the place of "creeds and dogmas," the miracles and prophesies on which faith is founded will also disappear.

"Why should the theology of an enlightened age insist upon a a belief in them?" Here we may ask: "Why should such impious disbelief be called theology? If there is no dogma, no creed, nothing to be believed, nothing to be taught, it ought to be called *atheology*, or mythology, or perhaps better still, *idiosyncrasology*. It was once said: "Do not believe the word of God, disobey Him,

and you shall be enlightened." Then it was: "Be enlightened, and you shall disobey, and shall cease to believe." Now it is (all in the present tense, *progressive* form): "We are enlightened, we are disobeying, disbelieving."

As a proof of this, take the following: "But it may be that Christian dogma in its prevailing forms owes little to the so-called revelations of the Hebrew Scriptures. It owes even less to the marvellous teacher of Nazareth." Mr. Fiske must mean by "prevailing forms" the more advanced of the various Protestant forms; and for anything we know to the contrary, the statement may be correct. But this only shows in a still stronger light the *force of principle*. For as private judgment began by denying the authority of the Vicar of Christ it must, if true to itself, end by denying Christ Himself. If Christ's word is unreliable in one instance, it must be so in every instance. If "He that heareth you heareth me," addressed to the Apostles and their successors, is worth nothing, no word of Christ is worth anything. But denying Christ is denying God; therefore, we have now to deal with *atheology*. If the supernatural is denied, Christ is denied. For Christ is essentially supernatural. His assuming human nature, the hypostatic union, His conception and birth of a Virgin, His curing the sick, raising the dead, are all miraculous, that is, above the power of all created natures. If everything that is miraculous is superstitious, and everything that is old incredible, then, indeed, is the era of atheism already here.

Christian dogma owing little or nothing to Christ? O absurdity! Why call it Christian, then? In the name of common sense, you contradict the common consent of mankind for the last nineteen centuries. And this consent is an evidence of truth, as Seneca says: *Apud nos veritatis argumentum est, aliquid omnibus videri.*" Call it at once by its right name, anti-Christian audacity.

"But the doctrine," we are told, "that what has been called the 'divine record' is inspired, is not of the substance of a genuine religious faith. Belief in the miraculous is by no means necessary to a devout state of mind." Good for private judgment! But if the "divine record" is not inspired, it is not the word of God, not divine, and the last Protestant contradicts the first. For Luther said that all of the divine record that did not contradict him was inspired. And each follower of Luther thus far has held that what his private judgment allowed to remain was certainly inspired. But now we have it from Mr. Fiske that none of it is inspired, or rather that it "is not of the substance of genuine religious faith" to hold that it is inspired. It is a mere accident then, at most. But no; for if religious faith can be genuine while resting on a human record (and it must be human, if not divine),

then would the accident that it was divine, coming to or affecting the genuine religious faith, destroy its substance or essence, by making it at once divine and human, which it cannot be. It is essential to genuine religious faith, therefore, that it rest not on a divine record. God must have nothing to do with it, even if He does exist, which existence private judgment has yet to accord Him.

Just think of it. Human reason to have a religion imposed upon it! one not of its own choosing! As though enlightened and educated men did not know how much and what to believe, or whether they should or should not believe at all? Are we going back to the *dark ages?* A "devout state of mind" has no need to believe in Christianity, for "belief in the miraculous" is by no means necessary to that state, and Christianity is built upon the miraculous. A devout state of mind can exist, then, without Christianity. But Christ says: "He that is not with me is against me." Therefore, an anti-Christian may be a devout man. But there is only one God, and Christ is God; therefore, an atheist may be a devout man.

But this is not all. Private judgment, instinct with progressiveness, becomes at length evolutionist. It says: "Is it not plain that religious development and adjustment have ever been the product of human need, and of human effort to supply that need? Like government and social relations, in which the spiritual instinct has worked its way toward the light?" How far-reaching this wonderful law of evolution is! But the principle of private judgment reaches still farther. It comprehends all things, and is itself comprehended by nothing. Intellectuality and morality being evolved from lower forms of life, and life in turn from inorganic elements, religion must of course come next by necessary development. From far down in mere matter the "spiritual instinct has worked its way toward the light," and, under the influence of necessary progress, has been steadily advancing from light to light, from lesser to greater, till to-day it stands revealed in all the effulgence of noonday brightness.

And now comes the last trumpet-blast to perfect reform. "Has not the time come when that branch of the Christian Church that derived its life from the right to think and to protest, should cast off the shackles of creed?" Certainly it has. No minimizing. Have the courage of your principle, private judgment; carry it to its legitimate conclusion. Separate Protestantism *toto cœlo* from the Church of Rome which "is built upon superstition and still finds support in it," that is, in dogma and creed.

Attention! reader. The following is not a quotation from Bossuet; it is the utterance of Mr. Fiske. "Their variety (doctrines

and creeds) and the changes they have undergone are evidence of error, not of truth. Truth is one, and as men approach it they draw together, not apart. The division of the Protestant Church into many sects is conclusive evidence that the inharmonious dogmas that have been wrought into the fabric of theological belief are not of the original and enduring substance of the teaching of Jesus. They are but variations of human error, determined by the state of knowledge and of thought in which they were conceived, by men seeking sincerely and devoutly for the truth."

Magna est veritas et prevalebit! But there are two ways to unity, one by all believing the same revealed truths, the other by all rejecting them. At which of these unities our Protester is aiming can be doubtful to none. He is a true Hegelian. For Hegel taught that to be and not to be, entity and nonentity, are identical, since both are absolutely indeterminate, and things that are equal to the same, are equal to each other. Thus this transcendent genius used one axiom to destroy another, that of Identity against that of Contradiction. But Mr. Fiske is equally clever. All who believe the same revealed truths are so far one, all who believe none of them are also one. But unity is the end to be reached, the *summum bonum*, and the easiest way to the end is the best, and the best means should be adopted. Unbelief is easier than belief; therefore unbelief must be adopted.

Now he waxes eloquent, touching off some rounded sentences with: "But through all this fabric of man-made theologies, strikes the light of scientific and critical research, of knowledge and reason, in these waning days of the nineteenth century; and behind the flaming torch of enlightened thought follows the plain daylight of common sense, dispersing the owls and bats of ancient superstition, the spectres and hobgoblins of a distorted faith."

We cannot look too closely at this, because of its excessive light. It either finds or makes bats and owls wherever it strikes. It is a flaming, two-edged sword. It is more effective than the *sistrum* of Isis. Here is a specimen of his exegetics: "'Believe in me and ye shall be saved' calls for no faith in doctrines of inspiration, of future rewards and punishment, of miraculous birth and death, of vicarious atonement, or in any of the other mystic dogmas that have been erected into an incongruous congeries of ecclesiastical systems."

This means that we are to believe in Jesus Christ, but not to believe His words: "Come ye blessed of My Father, possess the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world"; for that kingdom is a future reward. Nor those other words of his: "Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, which was pre-

pared for the devil and his angels"; for this is a future punishment. "Ye shall be saved" does not imply a future world then, but only has reference to this. But how or from what are believers in Jesus Christ to be saved here in this life? From death? No; all must die. From sickness, infirmity, disappointment, sorrow? No; these are some of the many ills which all flesh is heir to. Surely such a *saving* is not worth doing anything for, let alone believing in; nor with such a faith is "life worth living."

"What, then, is it (the world) to do?" asks Mr. Fiske. He answers: "The changing and revision of creeds is a perplexing task." *Credo.* "But there is no occasion for undertaking it." *Credo.* "The world does not want new creeds devised by fallible men to stem the tide of progress." *Credo.* Let them come into the old infallible Church. "Let the church of universal humanity, built up through the ages with the materials that each age afforded, open wide its doors to all who seek the true and the good, who wish to promote right conduct in themselves and others, and who desire to co-operate for the elevation and improvement of mankind, and let no test for membership be required except the ordinary evidences of good faith." Avaunt! deceiver, impostor, Private Judgment! There is no church of universal humanity, no church of any creature, but only the Church of the living God. "Who seek the true and the good!" There is no true, no good, without the supernatural, and this you have denied. "Promote right conduct in themselves and others!" There is no right conduct away from the eternal standard of all rectitude, the will of the Almighty, whose commands you set aside as a tablet of myths, a fiction. "Co-operate for the elevation and improvement of mankind!" There is no elevation for mankind without the Divine Elevator, who came down to us through His assumed humanity, that He might elevate us to assuming his Divinity. But this union of a divine and a human nature in the one Divine person of Jesus Christ you deny by denying the supernatural and the miraculous. You improve not mankind; you degrade them, you sink them below the level of the brute. Man was created for a supernatural end. If he tends to that end through the supernatural means of grace afforded him, he is far above the level of mere nature. If he refuses to accept the proffered means, he turns his back on his exalted destiny, and through his perversity sinks below the natural level of rational nature, even below the brutes. He is more cruel and vindictive than they, more vicious and depraved in proportion as he is more enlightened and intelligent, if he tends not to his end by virtue.

If one of two contradictory principles is false, the other must be true. Private judgment in matters of religion has been weighed

and found wanting, has scattered destruction all along its course. Authority, therefore, legitimate authority, is the only true and safe rule to guide us in religion. As there is no legitimate power but from God, so there is no authority that does not rest on Him. As He is the first principle of all things by creation, so is He the regulator of all things by His providence. His law is the rule for every free will that He has created. It belongs to the sovereign Lord to say how He is to be served, to the final end to determine the means to come to Him, to God to establish religion. He Himself came on earth to establish it, and built His Church up on the Rock to perpetuate it. He placed rulers over this spiritual kingdom, and one supreme head over all, His own vicar on earth. He gave them His own power, and to His vicar, infallibility. He made it obligatory on all to hear these rulers of His Church and to follow their guidance, saying: "If any man will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican." What more reasonable than to submit reason to Truth Itself, the Author of reason? If He makes use of parents in giving us immortal souls and our present life, may He not make use of men, spiritual fathers, in giving us the life of His life, His grace here and eternal happiness with Himself hereafter? If we believe a truthful man, why shall we not believe the Infinite Truth, Infinite Perfection? We have His word for it, that in believing what the Church teaches, we believe what He teaches; in obeying her, we obey Him: "He that heareth you heareth Me"; and "Without faith it is impossible to please God."

Behold the force of principle! The principle of authority in religion is strong by the strength of God, stronger than heaven and earth; for it rests on the words of the eternal Word, Who said: "Heaven and earth will pass away, but My words shall not pass away." It is stronger than any human power. In the minds and hearts of the early Christians it baffled the whole force of the Roman Empire, put forth in ten bloody persecutions. It triumphed over tortures and death itself thirteen million of times in the holy martyrs. It rendered delicate virgins and tender boyhood superior to the rage of tyrants and the mockeries, threats and wiles of the impious. It towered aloft in the genius of St. Augustine, and brought down his eagle mind to affirm: "I would not believe the Gospel, but for the authority of the Catholic Church." It sounded the depths of philosophy in the Angelic Doctor, and gathered treasures of knowledge from every field of scientific research down through the ages. Those who followed this principle could say: "Credidi, propter quod locutus sum!" In matters of religion, in the supernatural, they held that they should believe in order to know, not know in order to believe. St. Thomas could say to

apparent science: "Science, you are false; for you contradict what is absolutely true, the revealed word of God as interpreted by the infallible Church of God, and no two truths can contradict each other, since truth is that which is, and if it is it is, and cannot not be. I must therefore search for the natural truth of science in another direction. Now I have found what I sought! This contradicts no known truth, and besides approves itself perfectly to reason."

How much unnecessary and fruitless labor is spared to that great intellect by constantly following the principle of authority! Only he who has tried to read understandingly the works of St. Thomas can appreciate the force of his guiding principle, which enabled him to accomplish such prodigies within the very moderate span of life allotted him, forty-eight years.

THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

IN the October number of the QUARTERLY a brief sketch was given of the recent persecutions of the Uniat Greek Catholics of Lithuania. It is now proposed to say a few words respecting the condition of the Latin Catholics in the Russian dominions, who are still officially recognized as Catholics. They form a large body, numbering from eight to nine millions, and including the most highly civilized portion of the subjects of the empire. Nominally they are guaranteed the free exercise of their religion, but in practice the rule to which they are subject is very much like the English penal code of the last century in Ireland. The government removes their bishops and priests at its will, and in the same manner forbids the appointment of successors to vacancies among the clergy. It closes churches, suppresses convents, and even in certain cases forbids the administration of the sacraments without police permission. The comparative isolation of Russia from the other nations of the civilized world keeps the condition of its Catholic subjects almost unknown abroad. What the toleration really is which Russian absolutism grants to the Catholic Church we shall endeavor to convey to our readers.

The great bulk of the Catholic population in Russia is Polish,

or of Polish origin. Poland holds in the Russian Empire, in a religious aspect, a place similar to that which Ireland holds in the British. In each case a conquered nation has retained its religion, while its conquerors have allowed their original Christianity to be made subservient to the commands of their rulers. In Russia the divergence of the State Church from its Catholic original is much less than in England. It bears a close resemblance to the English schism as set up by Henry VIII. The most important Catholic doctrines and rites have been retained. The sacrifice of the Mass, the administration of the Sacraments, the invocation of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, prayers for the dead, the practice of fasting, and most other Catholic practices are retained in the Russian schismatic Church to-day. In one point it is in agreement with the Anglican Established Church, and that is in acknowledging the sovereign as the supreme religious guide and teacher of his subjects. The State religion is what it pleases the Czar to make it by law. Under it individual freedom of conscience finds no place. Indeed, the rejection of the supreme headship of the Church in the Sovereign Pontiff is the chief distinctive doctrine of the Russian schism. A large number of practices, indifferent in themselves, have been given an extravagant importance in the schismatic Church to make a distinction in the eyes of the common people between the religion of the Czar and that of the Catholic Church. Thus the use of organs or of statues in the churches is prohibited, though pictures, enclosed in copper raised outlines, are everywhere used. The Russians pray standing, and only prostrate themselves on the ground at intervals during the celebration of the Mass and public prayers. Any deviation from these established usages is regarded as little, if at all, short of heresy. Thus the Czar, Ivan the Terrible, who was contemporary with the English Elizabeth, proclaimed it a mortal sin to shave the beard as a disfigurement of God's image in man. His successor, Peter, the Great, on the other hand, ordered all his lay subjects to shave their beards under the penalty of high treason. In general, the ruling principle of the schism in Russia is that the monarch has the sole right to prescribe what his subjects shall believe and how they shall act. It is regarded as treason for a Russian subject to abandon the State Church, or to receive the sacraments otherwise than as prescribed by law. The Russians who have become Catholics, like Madame Swetchine or our own Prince Galitzin, have had to abandon their country at once. Residents in Russia, whether foreigners or subjects, who have never belonged to the State Church, are allowed by law to practice their own religion, but no liberty of conscience whatever is allowed to the old Russians. The Catholics in Russia are, therefore, entirely made up of the inhabitants of provinces

conquered by or annexed to the Empire during the last century, or of colonists who have settled within its limits. The German colonies, which were founded in the rich prairies of Southern Russia after the conquest of the Crimean Tartars by Catherine II., are the largest body of these Catholic immigrants, and a diocese has been founded for them at Saratof in that country. Foreign settlers have also been long established in the great cities, and some of them have occupied high administrative offices and positions at Court. Thus the Governor of Poland, in 1862, was a Catholic of French descent, General Lambert, and a son of Prince Beauharnais, the stepson of Napoleon I., was married to a Russian archduchess, and held a high rank at the Imperial Court. The great mass of the Catholic population is, however, made up of the Poles and Lithuanians, who have steadily retained their faith since the conquest of their native land and its incorporation into the Russian Empire.

The original Polish State, or Republic of Poland as it was styled by its people, consisted of two great divisions—Poland proper, to the west, and Lithuania, with its dependent provinces of Podolia, Volhynia, and the Ukraine, on the east—reaching from the Baltic Sea to the borders of Turkey. Originally distinct, Poland and Lithuania had been united under one government by the marriage in the 14th century of the Polish Queen Hedwig with the Lithuanian Grand Prince Jagellon, who became sovereign of the united countries, and the real founder of modern Poland. The Lithuanians, who were less civilized, adopted Polish manners and language, and the union of the two countries became as close as that of Castile and Aragon in the Spain of our own time. At the time of the partitions of Poland between Russia, Prussia and Austria, the Lithuanian territory was first seized by Catharine. Warsaw itself, at first fell to the share of Prussia, from whose king it was taken by Napoleon after the battle of Jena. The territory thus taken was erected by Napoleon into an independent state, under the title of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, the sovereignty of which was conferred on the king of Saxony, but which had its own national administration and army. On the downfall of Napoleon the Congress of Vienna regulated Europe according to its own will. The Grand Duchy was transferred to Alexander of Russia as a separate and constitutional state, under the name of Kingdom of Poland, while the Lithuanian provinces were incorporated into the Russian empire under the name of Polish provinces. They were also guaranteed a separate administration within the empire, but with no constitution like that given to the kingdom. Nicholas, in 1832, swept away the constitution of Poland, and, though its separate existence is still recognized, its government has

since been ever more and more assimilated to that of the Russian provinces. It still retains, however, the superiority which its old civilization gives it among the half-barbarous populations of the empire. The literature of the kingdom of Poland, with its seven millions of people, is to-day greater than that of the whole of Russia besides. In manufactures it also leads the way, and under the ordinary course of events its population would seem to be called at no distant date to an important part in the direction of the Russian empire.

The Catholics of Polish race, however, are not confined to the former Polish territory. There is a considerable movement always going on among the population of the Russian empire, something analogous to that which has filled up our own Western States during the last half century. The rich plains of southern Russia, which were only annexed to the empire by Catharine the Second, offered, and still offer, strong temptations to immigrants from all parts of the empire. Among these many Polish families have removed to the new settlements and founded villages, while others have passed into Asia and are scattered all over the frontiers of the empire, much in the same way as Irish Catholics are in India and the British colonies. The Polish nation, in spite of its misfortunes, is growing in numbers and permeating the empire, and, like the Irish, it carries its religion with it. The Russian government puts every obstacle in its way, as the English did in the case of the Irish emigrants before Catholic Emancipation, but still the Polish element continues to increase. It is a significant fact that, some time ago, several of the most violent Russian leaders urged that the Polish provinces should be separated from Russia by a line of custom houses, as their competition was ruining Russian manufacturers. The proposition was not adopted, but it indicates the growth of Poland even under the restrictions imposed on it by a hostile and despotic government.

To understand the attitude of the Imperial Government towards its Catholic subjects is difficult for any one not familiar with Russian life and ideas. The Czar and his ministers make no pretence to special religious zeal against Catholic doctrines. They do not declare them "damnable and idolatrous," as English statesmen were used to do; nor do they regard the Pope as Antichrist, or refuse to hold any communication with the Roman See. In words, the Russian Government is respectful towards the Catholic Church and its head. With occasional interruptions, diplomatic relations are maintained with the Holy See, and different Czars have testified a high personal respect for the reigning Pontiffs. At the same time, no scruple is made of closing Catholic churches, of suppressing seminaries and convents, of banishing bishops from

their dioceses, of forbidding communication on religious matters between its Catholic subjects and the Head of their Church, of intruding nominees of the Czar into the place of Catholic bishops and priests, and of prohibiting the administration of the sacraments, and even of religious instruction, by the clergy at the will of the Czar. The emperor claims the right of deciding who are Catholics and who are not, irrespective of the convictions and free will of his subjects. He proclaims the fullest toleration for all creeds, subject to the laws of the empire, but he reserves to himself absolutely the making of the laws. Are Catholic churches open in St. Petersburg and Warsaw; are Catholic bishops treated as important personages by the governors of provinces; are Catholics employed in high offices of the army, the administration, and the court; the government declares that its tolerance is universal and known to all the world. Is a Catholic population driven by soldiers to a schismatic church, or a Catholic banished for confessing to a Catholic priest, or having his child baptized by one,—that is declared to be a purely political act of the administration. Genuine freedom of conscience is, in fact, impossible under the existing form of government in Russia. The monarch claims absolute dominion over his subjects, in both civil and religious matters. Obedience to his commands in everything is the cardinal dogma of the Russian despotic monarchy. The Czar is head of the Church as well as of the State, and the State Church is merely a board of his administration, subject to the same "general regulation" as the Naval Office or the Ministry of Agriculture. That Catholics should recognize such a power on the part of any human authority is impossible while they continue Catholics. Does the government forbid Catholic priests to hear the confessions of penitents, or command them to reveal the secrets of the confessional to the police, —as is the actual law of the schismatic church—the priests must disobey the law or place themselves outside the Church's pale. Does it prohibit a Catholic parent from having his child baptized, or himself from receiving the sacraments in a Catholic church, he too must disobey, or incur the guilt of mortal sin. The government, however, pretends to look on such orders as part of its civil powers, and describes disobedience to them as an offence against the ordinary laws of the empire. The Catholic Church, the divinely established teacher of supernatural truth, has ever refused to accept such a doctrine, and hence its condition in Russia is a constant struggle for existence against the hostility of the government.

The condition of the Catholic subjects of the Czar, however, varies greatly in different parts of the empire. In the great cities like St. Petersburg, Odessa or Riga, the government makes compara-

tively little interference with the exercise of religion. Since the time of Peter the Great, the policy of the Czars has been to attract immigration from more civilized nations, and to attain that object, freedom of religion has been conceded to immigrants. French or German Catholics, and their descendants, are allowed to practice their religion almost without State interference, except in the matter of mixed marriages or of any attempt at conversion of schismatics. In Poland, where the Catholics form the bulk of the population, much severer restrictions are placed on the Church. The administration constantly interferes in religious affairs, and endeavors to make the clergy entirely subordinate to its own authority. The building or repairing of churches, the establishment of convents or hospitals, and still more of schools, are illegal, except by special permission from the authorities, which is frequently refused. The bishops and priests are very often exiled or imprisoned without any form of trial by administrative process or a simple command of the minister, and churches are thus left without pastors for many years. The late Archbishop of Warsaw, Mgr. Felinski, spent twenty years in exile in a remote part of Russia, where he was kept from all communication with his diocese, and under police supervision like an ordinary criminal. The catechism taught to the children, and even the Sunday sermons of the clergy, are subjected to the police censorship. The appointment of priests to parishes, and the admission of students to the seminaries, are arbitrarily controlled by the government. From time to time, as after the insurrection of 1830, and again in 1863 and the following years, there are fierce outbursts of persecution, in which the public exercise of worship is almost practically suspended.

The condition of the Catholic population in Lithuania and the old Polish provinces is still worse. The Catholic churches are there frequently seized by the authorities and handed over to the State Church, while the Catholic population are not permitted to replace them by others at their own expense. In the Archdiocese of Mohilef, the Primatial Catholic See of Russia and the largest diocese in the world, which includes a territory twice the extent of the United States, the diocesan seminary was arbitrarily suppressed by the Emperor Nicholas some years ago. The so-called Roman Catholic College, a board of ecclesiastics appointed by the government and controlled by it, has supreme power over the internal administration of the dioceses, and deprives the bishops of most of their jurisdiction over their clergy. A disobedient or immoral priest is often maintained in his parish in spite of his bishop's suspension, and any attempt to give him a successor exposes the bishop to banishment. The very right to be considered Catholics is only allowed at the discretion of the government. It

has frequently happened that large bodies of Catholics were officially declared to be members of the State Church, because the police authorities had decided that their grandfathers were once schismatics. In such cases the profession of the Catholic faith becomes an act of treason, and the administration of any sacrament to them by a Catholic priest involves him in the same charge. To hear the confession of a Catholic who has been pronounced a schismatic by the police, is a crime of the highest magnitude in Russia for a Catholic priest. For all Russians belonging to the State Church no religious freedom whatever exists. The government, composed as it is in a large part of infidels and partly of Protestants, prescribes what its orthodox subjects shall believe, how often they shall communicate, how they shall pray, and, above all, what are their duties towards the emperor. The schismatic priests must make their sacred functions a part of the policy of the empire. A law requires them, under the severest penalties, to reveal to the police the secrets intrusted to them in confession whenever they have a bearing on political matters. Another law prescribes the exact number who may enter the schismatic convents or monasteries, and regulates the age and other conditions of their admission to a religious life. The Russian Church admits, like the Catholic, the divine origin of the Christian hierarchy, and that the bishops, under their lawful head, are the sole guardians of revealed truth. For centuries it recognized the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople as its head by divine right. At the end of the sixteenth century the Czar Fedor obtained for a pecuniary consideration from the Greek Patriarch of the time, Jeremias, himself appointed by the Sultan, the appointment of a Patriarch of Moscow as supreme head of the Russian Church. About a century later, Peter the Great, on the death of the patriarch, Nicon, decided to leave the post vacant, and substituted in his place a body of bishops, priests and government officials as the supreme authority in religious affairs. The Holy Synod, as this body is named, is still the only head of the Russian State Church, and as the emperor names and removes all members of the synod at will, his ukases are virtually the only rule of faith and morals among his subjects.

Could the Catholic Church be rendered equally subservient to the emperor's will, the government would care little for its abstract dogmas. A schismatic Latin Church, or one which practically accepted the government as its guide in everything, would be as useful an instrument of rule as the Greek schism. From the first seizure of Polish territory in 1772 down to the present, the policy of Russia has been to reduce the Catholic Church in its dominions to that condition. Catharine the Second had no sooner seized on the province of White Russia, than she guaranteed full freedom

of conscience to its Catholic people, but at the same time, of her own imperial power, she proceeded to establish a new Catholic diocese in her dominions, without any authority from the Sovereign Pontiff. The Catholic dioceses in the north of Europe are, for the most part, very extensive, and in Poland especially it is usual to have one or more suffragan bishops in each, without any jurisdiction of their own. The Catholic diocese of Wilna, of which White Russia formed a part, was administered by Mgr. Massalski, who procured the consecration of a suffragan, to reside in the Russian territory, in the person of Mgr. Siestrencewicz. The latter was a courtier by nature, and he devoted himself to the interests of the Russian Court, without reserve. Though only a simple delegate of his bishop, Catharine at once recognized him as the head of the Church in her dominions, and gave to him the control of the College of Justice in St. Petersburg in all matters of ecclesiastical discipline. To prevent worse, the Holy See erected the diocese of Mohilef in the newly-conquered territory. This was subsequently raised to an archdiocese in 1784, and made the Metropolitan See of the Catholic Church in Russia. The whole of the old Russian Empire is included in the jurisdiction of its archbishop, which thus extends from the Dnieper to the Arctic Ocean and Behring's Straits, from the borders of Sweden to those of China. This immense diocese Archbishop Siestrencewicz continued to administer for more than half a century. He was consecrated in 1773 and took up his residence as Bishop of Mohilef in the following year, and his death only occurred in 1826, at the age of ninety-five. It was a period of unexampled confusion, both in the world and in the Church. The latter was attacked on every side. The emperor Joseph in Germany interfered with the jurisdiction of the Holy See and tried to change the relations of Church and State. The ancient German Empire was swept away by Napoleon, and its territory remodelled. The French Church was overthrown by the revolution, and only restored with a diminished episcopate by the Concordat of 1802. Two Popes in succession were carried away prisoners from Rome, and for several years all direct communication with the Holy See was impossible to the Catholic world. The occasion was then peculiarly favorable for Catharine's project of reducing the Catholic Church in Russia to a condition like that of the existing body known as Old Catholics in Germany and Switzerland. Russia had bought from the patriarch of Constantinople, a hundred years before, all his jurisdiction over the schismatic church. Her rulers flattered themselves that they could repeat the same policy with regard to the Latin Church and the Holy See. Siestrencewicz was an excellent instrument for such a policy. As a Catholic bishop, appointed by the Holy See,

and professing himself subject to its authority, he had religious jurisdiction over the consciences of the Catholic population. Whenever he exceeded his powers or chose to change the discipline or government of the Church, he could count on the government to prevent any complaints being addressed to the Sovereign Pontiff, or any communication being received from him. For a time Siestrencewicz was virtually independent of the Holy See, though professing to respect its authority. He changed the courses of Catholic instruction in the schools and seminaries, and ordered Canon Law to be taught to his clergy "within the limits prescribed by the Empress," and made a Jansenist catechism, condemned by the Holy See, the basis of Catholic teaching. He even went so far as to become a member of the Protestant Bible Society established in England, and attempted to introduce it among the Catholics of Russia. When ordered by a Brief of Pius VII. to retract the circular in which he recommended this society, the government forbade its publication in Russia, and Siestrencewicz continued in his course, without regard to the communications of the Holy See. The members of the Religious Orders of both sexes were also forbidden to communicate with their Generals outside Russia, and were made subject in everything absolutely to the will of the archbishop. All appeals in matters of Catholic discipline were ordered to be decided by the Roman Catholic College of St. Petersburg, consisting of one ecclesiastic from each diocese, approved of by the government, and two others appointed by it absolutely. The Archbishop of Mohilef was at the head of this body, but, at the discretion of the government, he might be replaced by any other bishop. The college itself is subject to the senate of the empire, and can only publish its decrees on Catholic discipline or doctrine by the permission of that body. Communications with the Holy See may only be made through the Russian Ministry, which publishes or withholds the answers at its own discretion. On the death of a bishop, the government presents what names it pleases for his successor to the Sovereign Pontiff, and, if he refuses to accept them, the sees are left vacant, or administrators are appointed by the government itself. When the Holy See addresses inquiries as to the fitness of the candidates thus presented to it, to the clergy of Poland, the latter are forbidden under the severest penalties to answer unless through the government, and in accordance with its wishes. Such is the actual state of the Catholic Church in Russia to-day, and it is only little short of miraculous that it has still preserved the Faith untarnished during the long century of its oppression.

During the reign of Alexander the First, the rival of Napoleon, the attitude of the government was much more favorable to the

Church than it had been under Catharine. Alexander himself had leanings towards Catholicity, and it is even said that he was received into the Church on his death-bed. However this may be, he allowed Catholics comparative liberty during his reign, though he rigorously prohibited the conversion of schismatics, or even of the Uniat Catholics who had been enrolled in the State Church by force. On the death of Alexander active persecution began under Nicholas. In 1828 an imperial ukase was issued which would virtually have left the Church without clergy in a couple of generations. All candidates for the priesthood were required, before they could be received into a seminary, to present titles of nobility, and, besides, to have finished the course of studies of some Russian university, and to be twenty-five years of age. Each candidate had further to provide a substitute in the army, to pay one hundred and fifty rubles towards the support of the schismatic church, and finally to obtain permission from the Minister of Public Worship at St. Petersburg. This decree, could it have been enforced, would have virtually prevented any supply of priests to replace the existing clergy, but its violence defeated itself, and it has remained practically unexecuted. It is, however, a striking instance of the methods of Russian despotism in its pretended policy of toleration.

The convents were the next object of attack. In the Lithuanian provinces, at the accession of Nicholas, the convents and monasteries of the Latin Rite numbered three hundred, exclusive of those of the Uniat Catholics. In 1832 two hundred were suppressed, their property seized, and their inmates either turned out or sent to the convents not yet suppressed. The plot for forcing the Uniats of Lithuania away from the Church was now at work, and to prevent the Latin Catholics from interfering with its success the government undertook to regulate the administration of the Sacraments by the Latin Catholic clergy. In 1837 an imperial ukase forbade Catholic priests to admit to the Sacraments "unknown persons," that is, those not belonging to their parishes. This was intended to prevent the persecuted Uniats from receiving any religious assistance, and it was subsequently re-enacted in 1859 by Alexander the Second. In that year Count Lunskoi, the Imperial Minister, issued a rescript, in which he stated:

"His Majesty the Emperor has learned that some Roman Catholic ecclesiastics have admitted members of the Orthodox Church to confession and communion. Accordingly his Majesty the Emperor has deigned to command that such act be forbidden once more to all the Catholic clergy, under penalty of immediate expulsion from the country. . . . . His Majesty the Emperor orders at the same time that all ecclesiastics residing in the Government of Witebsk shall engage by a written promise not to

admit any but their own parishioners, *and persons furnished with authentic documents showing that they belong to the Catholic Church*, to confession, communion, or any religious act." In Russia to-day an imperial passport is necessary for a Catholic before he can approach the Sacraments. Such is the law of toleration for religious conscience so loudly proclaimed by the Russian Government.

Another order of 1842, which is still, we believe, in force, ordered every Catholic parish priest in Lithuania to present to the schismatic priest the list of his own parishioners, and obtain the signature of the latter to its truth. The liberty of being a Catholic thus depends on the good will of the schismatic clergy who, if so disposed, may claim, under different pretexts, Catholics as Russians. In such cases the State wholly ignores any right to freedom of belief. The Catholic has to choose between apostasy or banishment. His children, if he have any, will be brought up by force in the schismatic Church. In its system of perverting Catholic children the Russian Government seems to have closely copied the Irish penal code of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The ministry is empowered to take such measures as it thinks fit to secure the orthodoxy of children whose parents are suspected of Catholicity. At times this policy is pushed to extremes. After the storming of Warsaw and the overthrow of the Polish nation in 1830 an Imperial rescript that all the male orphans in the Kingdom of Poland between the ages of six and seventeen should be sought out for transportation to Minsk (in Lithuania), and sent in due succession to the companies of the military colonies. Those who have read the papers recently published in the *Century* magazine can form an idea of what the transportation to the military colonies meant for those unfortunate children who were, if they survived, to be brought up in the schismatic worship. It reminds one vividly of Richard Cromwell's letter, in which he offers to ship a thousand or more Irish orphans to the West Indies, as "the means of making them English," or as he naively puts it, "at least Christians."

Liberty of speech on religious matters is also denied by law to the Catholics of Russia and Poland. An edict of Nicholas, published in 1847, proscribes all public discussion of the differences between the Catholic Church and the Schism. The ukase enacts, amongst other provisions:

"The loss of all civil rights, and from six to ten years' imprisonment at hard labor, for whoever in a public place shall venture to find fault with religion, or the Christian church (*i.e.*, the Russian schism). For whoever hears such words and does not lodge information with the police, six months' to a year's imprisonment.

"For the same offence in writing or print, if spread in any way, banishment to the remotest districts of Siberia.

"For whoever induces a person to pass from the orthodox religion to another, exile to Tomsk or Tobolsk (Siberia).

"For having, by sermon or writing, attempted to induce an orthodox person to join any other religion, the first offence imprisonment for one to two years; the second, imprisonment from four to six years; the third, transportation to Tomsk or Tobolsk."

It is hard to say what this law cannot be made to apply to against Catholics. It is true that its general application is impossible. The Russian prisons would not suffice to hold the number of offenders were it put into execution strictly. At the same time, it is a powerful engine of oppression in the hands of hostile magistrates or police officers, and under its provisions obnoxious individuals only hold their personal freedom at the mercy of the officials even of low grade. This ukase was issued at almost the very time when Nicholas was signing a new Concordat with Pius the Ninth as a pledge of his protection to the Catholic Church in his empire.

This last fact is significant of the value which must be given to the promises made from time to time by the Russian Government to the Holy See. The Catholic world occasionally learns that arrangements have been made with the Holy Father for the appointment of Catholic bishops and the relaxation of the persecution of Catholics in Russia, and many are ready to believe that peace has thus been really restored to the Catholic Church there. Unfortunately, such is the reverse of the fact, The Czars and their ministers often find it expedient to relax the policy of destruction for a time, but it has never been yet abandoned, however fair the promises made by the Imperial Government. Catherine, in the Treaty of Partition in 1793, "promised irrevocably for herself, her heirs and successors, to maintain forever the Roman Catholics of both rites in the possession of their privileges, churches and property, and the free exercise of their worship and discipline." This solemn stipulation did not prevent the suppression of four thousand parishes and the forcible separation of nearly eight millions of Catholics from the Church within the following three years. Nicholas, in February, 1839, wrote, himself, to Gregory XVI.: "My son has exactly reported to me the affectionate words which your Holiness has deigned to charge him with for me. I am happy to reply by the renewed assurance, that I will never cease to count among the first of my duties that of protecting the welfare of my Catholic subjects, of respecting their convictions and assuring their peace." The very same month, the entire Uniat Catholic Church of Lithuania was officially proclaimed a part of

the State Church. A few years before, when the nomination of Monsignor Pawlowski to the Archdiocese of Mohileff was asked by the Russian Government, the Russian minister to Rome, Fuhrman, solemnly pledged his word to the Holy Father that the ukase which forbade Catholic priests to administer the sacraments to the Uniat Catholics, had been revoked. This, the Holy Father himself published in a subsequent allocution, but it did not prevent the ukase from continuing in full force, nor its emphatic republication by Alexander the Second, after the close of the Crimean War. A concordat was signed by Nicholas in 1847, when the revolutions in France and Germany had suggested even to his despotic temper the necessity of temporizing with his Polish subjects. As soon as the political danger had passed, the concordat was simply disregarded. The Uniat Diocese of Chelm in Poland itself was suppressed by Alexander in exactly the same way as those of Lithuania had been by his father, before the concordat. In 1863, the time of the last Polish insurrection, when the churches of Warsaw had been closed for four months, and the administrator of the Archdiocese kept in close imprisonment, the Russian Government presented the name of Monsignor Felinski as an acceptable candidate for the vacant See. Within a few months he, too, was sent into exile to the remotest province of European Russia without a trial, and had to spend no less than twenty years away from his diocese. With such a series of facts before us, we can attach little faith to the result of any negotiations between the Russian Government and the Holy See. The whole policy of the empire, in religious matters at least, must be radically changed before any sensible improvement can be expected in the external conditions of the Catholic Church in Russia. The fundamental law, which declares that "once a schismatic, always a schismatic," must be swept away, and the imperial despot must recognize that conscience at least is above his control, before persecutions will really cease for the Catholic Church in Russia.

That it will have an end sooner or later, there is no room for doubt. The autocratic system of government is already rotten; and the enormous accessions of territory which Russia has received, and is still receiving in Asia, will but hasten its fall. The State Church exercises almost no influence over the educated classes of the empire, and yet religion is felt to be an absolute necessity by the whole Russian people. The Catholic Church alone can fulfil its wants in this respect, and now, as in the days of Diocletian, it well may be that the darkest hour of persecution is only the precursor of the glorious dawn of religious liberty in the Russian Empire.

LOYALTY TO ROME AND COUNTRY.

AMERICAN literature has been enriched of late with various publications going to prove that Catholics cannot be loyal citizens of the republic. It is not a new thesis. It has done service ever since Celsus and Porphiry used it against the nascent Church and their readers shouted "*Christiani ad leones!*" Nor is there usually anything very original or striking in these new presentations of the subject. Most of the arguments have been in stock since controversy began. True, they have been refuted hundreds of times; but they serve their purpose just as well. One is not apt to be very scrupulous about his verifications when assailing a cause against which the prejudices of the bulk of his hearers are already enlisted.

Among these attacks upon Catholic loyalty, perhaps the most respectable for show of erudition and fair-play is the article of Mr. Henry Charles Lea, "Key-Notes from Rome," in the *Forum* of last February. In the belief that a reply to these charges is due to the American public, the above-named article is here selected for review, as the best of its class.

Mr. Lea opens with a quotation from the speech of Mr. Daniel Dougherty at our recent Catholic Congress, in which he protests against the prejudice which has, from time immemorial, "denied to Catholics the highest honors of the republic, sought to deprive us of our constitutional rights, and branded us as tools of a foreign potentate, unworthy to enjoy the name of Americans." On this he comments thus:

> "Perhaps the eloquent orator may obtain an inkling of the cause of this apparent injustice, if he will weigh the words of a speaker who followed him, Father Nugent, of Liverpool, who stated that the idea of the Congress had originated with the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and the Archbishop of St. Paul. Herein lies the trouble. The Catholic Church is not American or independent; it looks abroad and not at home for its guidance."

This is a most singular use of facts. Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, Minnesota, whom every one knows to be one of the most thorough-going of Americans, conferred with Cardinal Manning about the organizing of a congress of all English-speaking Catholics. There was for some time question of its being held in London. But the English were slow, and our American centenary got ahead of them, and so we held the congress by ourselves. These are the facts stated by Father Nugent. And in

these Mr. Lea finds "an inkling of the cause" of the injustice done to Catholics, by the charge that "the Catholic Church looks abroad and not at home for its guidance." The logic of this opening argument is not over-happy.

As further proofs that the Church is "not American or independent," he goes on to state that the Pope authorizes the holding of our councils and sanctions their decrees, that he appoints our Bishops, and that "even so trivial a matter as the introduction of electric lighting in the churches, we are told, has to be referred to the decision of the Propaganda." This last bit of newspaper gossip is so silly and groundless that we may dismiss it at once. On his other arguments we comment as follows:

Assuredly the Catholic Church in this country is not "American and independent," in the sense of its being a separate national Church. It is a member of the world-wide, universal Church, closely associated with all its other members in all other parts of the world, and equally with them acknowledging the jurisdiction over the entire flock which Christ gave to St. Peter. The Church in America is in the same situation as the Church in France, in England, in Belgium, in Spain, in Germany or at the ends of the earth. Everywhere the bishops receive their mission from the chief pastor; everywhere councils are held under his supreme direction, everywhere, through the influence of that divinely appointed centre of unity, the whole Church grows together, as its divine author said it should, like one vine, acts together like one body.

But, because the Church in America is thus an integral member of the Church universal, does it thence follow that it is not American, that Catholics do not deserve the name of Americans? The question answers itself to every mind not blinded by prejudice. The Church in America, while living with the life of the Church universal, lives also its own life, has its own character, is composed of American citizens and those who aim at becoming such, and has for its mission the spiritual welfare of the American people. History declares the part that Catholics have everywhere taken in advancing the prosperity and glory of their various nations. Gibbon acknowledges that the bishops made France; it has been said that the monks made England: and whoever studies the causes of the prosperity of the United States will hardly fail to recognize the share of credit due to Catholics and their clergy.

Nor can it be justly said that the Church in America is governed with a view to interests which are not American, or that in regard to our great social problems her authorities are guided by principles which are not American. The fact which especially distinguishes and ennobles America among the other nations of the earth is that

her spirit and her principles are not narrow and exclusive, but cosmopolitan, international, universal. One of the greatest obstacles to the advancement of civilization throughout the world has been the diversities, the alienations, the antagonisms, of races and tongues and countries. The spirit of Christ and of the Church, which is essentially cosmopolitan and universal, while respecting all national rights, aims at uniting all nations in fraternity. Is not this evidently for the welfare of mankind? Is not this eminently in sympathy with the spirit and the principles of America? Of old, Tertullian said: "*Unam omnium rempublicam agnoscimus, mundum.* (*Apol.* 39.) St. Augustine, still more clearly: "*Ecclesia cives civibus, gentes gentibus, et omnes prorsus homines, primorum parentum recordatione, non societate tantum sed quadam fraternitate conjungit.*" (*De mor. Eccl., Cath., c.* 30, *n.* 65.) This is the spirit and aim of the Catholic Church. Who will say that it is contrary to the spirit of our country?

It is precisely in view of this cosmopolitan spirit and aim of the Church that Divine Providence placed its chief pastor in an international and cosmopolitan position, by guaranteeing his territorial independence. American Catholics very naturally desire that this cosmopolitan character of the Holy See should be maintained, that its spirit and influence should not be narrowed by being nationalized. Just as the rest of the world would not wish that the chief pastor of the universal Church should be distinctively an American bishop, so we do not wish that he should be distinctively a French or an Italian bishop, or a bishop of any other special nationality whatsoever. He must be the world bishop, and therefore he must be independent of nationalities. As such, he can nowhere be called "a foreign potentate." The Pope is no more a foreigner to the Catholics of any nation in the world than our President is a foreigner to any of the States composing the Union. Mr. Lea's assertion: "If they (Catholics) are 'branded as tools of a foreign potentate,' the brand is self-inflicted," is a mere impertinence.

"And if," he continues, "they are denied the highest honors of the republic, it is not through an unreasoning prejudice, but through the instinctive popular perception that they own obedience to a higher law than that which binds their fellow-citizens."

Now here we must be allowed to protest against a manner of speech which Mr. Lea, in common with others of his school, uses throughout. They seem to assume that Catholics do not form a part of the nation. They oppose to the Catholic Church "the instinctive popular perceptions," the "popular jealousy," of Americans, as if Catholics were not an integral part of the American people, as if her ten millions and more of Catholics did not form a very considerable proportion of the American people. He should say, rather,

"the instinctive perceptions," and "the jealousy" of a certain fraction of the American people, more or less imbued with sectarian prejudices against their fellow-citizens. We have always admired the art with which certain parties magnify themselves into the nation, the people, and arrogate to themselves the right of speaking in its name, just as certain writers identify themselves with progress, with science, with humanity. A little modesty is never out of place.

Mr. Lea is right if, in the above lines, he means to state that Catholics "own obedience to a higher law" than civil laws by whomsoever made. But surely he forgets himself if he wishes to intimate that in this they differ from their fellow-citizens. Every Christian, every religious man, nay, every honest man, regards the law of conscience as above all human laws. How identical this is with the duty of Catholics in regard to the law of the Church will be shown a little further on.

Our critic continues:

"In this no question of religious intolerance is involved. Not the least of the great political innovations reduced to practice by the fathers of the republic, was the severance of state and church. Prior to their time it had been an accepted maxim of statecraft that religion and politics were so inextricably intermingled that the state must recognize some form of faith, must render it dominant, and must enter into alliance with it to control the souls as well as the bodies and purses of its subjects. The framers of the Constitution wisely disregarded all precedent. They assumed that the state had nothing to do with the faith of the citizen. Abstaining from all formulas, they reverted to the natural law which guarantees to every human being the enjoyment of his creed, whether Buddhist or Confucian, Islamite or Jewish, Catholic or Protestant, Spiritualist or Agnostic. Even this did not satisfy the scruples of the people, and, to prevent all future misunderstanding, by the First Amendment the power was expressly denied to Congress to establish or prohibit any religion."

Mr. Lea affirms that the question of the political rights of American Catholics is not a question of tolerance or intolerance. Before examining his reasons for so affirming, we must first remark that this rather *naïve* paradox is a souvenir of Rousseau. The author of the *Contrat Social* would have a state religion; whoever would not accept the state religion should, he says, be banished, not for impiety, indeed, but for "unsociableness," for being out of harmony with the social system, for being incapable of sincerely loving the law of the land and of heartily laying down his life for it. "Happy distinction!" exclaims M. Saint-Marc Gerardin, "which puts the conscience of Rousseau at ease! In the convert to any other religion than that of the State, he does not punish the apostate, but the rebel; he respects the proselyte, he smites the bad citizen. The author of the *Contrat*, in fact, pushes his distinction to *naïveté* when he boldly condemns what he calls 'theological intolerance.'"

The distinction between Church and State, between temporal and spiritual authority, between divine and human things, is not an innovation dating from the birth of the American republic. It is a principle essentially Christian, proclaimed by our Lord Jesus Christ: "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's," and inflexibly applied by the Apostles: "We must obey God rather than men." (Acts v., 29.) It is also a principle essentially Catholic, which the Catholic Church, and she alone, has always maintained. The Church and the Popes maintained it against the efforts to confound the two orders made by the successors of Constantine, by the emperors of Byzantium, by the German emperors in the Middle Ages, by the kings of France and others. "To the emperor," exclaims St. Ambrose, "belong the palaces; to the priesthood the churches. To thee is entrusted the charge of civil affairs, not of things sacred." (Ep. xx., n. 19.) Pope St. Gelasius I. writes to the Emperor Anastasius: "If in matters of public order even the prelates of the Church obey thy laws, how fitting is it that, in what concerns religion, thou shouldst obey those to whom the dispensation of the sacred mysteries has been entrusted." And Pope St. Gregory II. thus addresses the Emperor Leo the Isaurian: "The affairs of the Church are administered by prelates who refrain from the business of the State; let the emperors in like manner refrain from ecclesiastical matters, and attend to the things committed to them." The same principle is admirably developed by Hugh of St. Victor in the Middle Ages. (De Sacr., lib. II., p. 2, c. 4.) And Leo XIII. thus propounds it in his encyclical, "Immortale Dei": "God has divided the government of the human race between two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil; the former being placed over things divine, the latter over things human. Each is supreme in its own sphere. Each has limits by which it is bounded, limits marked by the special nature and end of each, each having its own orbit, in which it moves and acts by its own right."

Not only do we affirm that the Catholic Church has always maintained this principle; we add that she alone has done so. The world knows how it has fared with the separated Christians of Russia and the East; they have fallen into subjection to the State even in all things spiritual. It is well known that, among the followers of the "Reformation," the civil power gradually took control of religious matters, that Henry VIII. forced from his subjects an oath acknowledging the royal supremacy in things spiritual, and that the Protestant princes of Germany held to the axiom: "*cujus est regio, illius est religio.*" Such was likewise the doctrine of the self-styled philosophers of the last century. Rousseau, in the last chapter of his "Contrat Social," develops his theory of lay

religion. He regards as the source of all social evils the establishment by our Lord of a spiritual kingdom on earth. According to him, the separation of the theological system from the political system broke up the unity of the State, and caused the intestine divisions ever since agitating Christian nations. "Among all writers," says he, "the philosopher Hobbes is the only one who has clearly seen the evil and its remedy, who has made bold to propose that the two heads of the eagle should be reunited and all things brought into political unity, without which no State and no government can be solidly established." (L. iv., c. 8.) It is, therefore, manifest that to assert the distinction of Church and State, and to assign to each its rightful place and powers, is to recognize a principle essentially and even exclusively Catholic.

But though Church and State are essentially distinct, though their qualities and ends and modes of action are different, it by no means follows that they are to be strangers to each other. Quite the contrary, and that for a very evident reason. Both reason and revelation declare that man lives a two-fold life, a life temporal and earthly, and a life spiritual and looking to eternity. He seeks the goods of time and the goods that are everlasting. To acquire temporal goods and advantages he has the assistance of the State, of civil society; to gain spiritual goods and perfection he has the aid of the Church, of the religious society. The Church and the State are, therefore, composed of the same members. Hence, as in his individual life, man may not seek after temporal goods to the neglect of his spiritual duty, but must keep harmony between the two sets of duties, so likewise in the social life, man while associated with his fellow-beings for the acquisition of earthly advantages, cannot forget that he is also associated with them for the attainment of spiritual goods. Therefore, to attempt to make the Church and the State strangers to each other is to attempt to divide up man himself. If, indeed, the Church were composed of men who did not belong to the State, and the State of men who did not belong to the Church, then there might well be but little question of the relations between the two. But such is not the case. Our Lord sends the message and the invitation of His Church to all nations and to every creature, and all are at the same time citizens of some State. Where all the citizens of a State are of the same religious communion, then the blending of Church and State naturally approaches the completeness of the blending of temporal and spiritual duties in the life of a good man. But where the citizens of a State differ in faith and, therefore, belong to different religious communions, there the blending of Church and State becomes impossible; their relations are necessarily limited; all must work together for what is for the common tem-

poral weal, but all must "agree to disagree" in what concerns spiritual duties and religious association.

Such is the condition of things in the United States; hence the system of almost total separation of Church and State, which is the natural and necessary consequence of the condition of the people, is in no way opposed to the principles of Catholic theology. Here again, therefore, the Constitution of the United States has innovated nothing, differs in nothing from the principles ever held by the Catholic Church.

Is it, then, true to say, as Mr. Lea does, that before the establishment of our Constitution it was a governmental maxim universally received, "that the State must recognize some form of faith, must render it dominant, and must enter into alliance with it to control the souls as well as the bodies and purses of its subjects?" We have but to recall the teachings of St. Ambrose, St. Gelasius, St. Gregory, and Leo XIII., quoted above, to see that the Catholic Church has never admitted such a relationship between Church and State as the one here pictured. But how near it comes to truly representing the principles and the practice of States that have separated from her may be concluded also from the historical facts already cited, which could easily be multiplied and even brought home to our own country. According to Catholic principles, it is the duty of the State, as a moral person, to render to God the homage due Him, as our country does, for example, on our annual Thanksgiving Day. It is the duty of the State to protect religion and the Church, as far as it may be needful and practicable. It is the right and the duty of the State to repress practices contrary to the natural law, even though exercised in the name of religion; the early Christian emperors used this power in regard to heathenism, the English for the suppression of monstrous practices in India, the French and others in Africa, and the United States government has done the same in the case of the Mormons. Again, the State seems to have the right to require certain religious acts considered necessary to civil life, such as the oath; and the United States, like all other countries, uses this power. But the State has no right to impose upon any one a form of religion. Faith is essentially a free act. The State has no right "to control the souls of its subjects."

But does it thence follow that "the natural law guarantees to every human being the enjoyment of his creed, whether Buddhist or Confucian, Islamite or Jewish, Catholic or Protestant, Spiritualist or Agnostic?" Here we must again make the distinction indicated above. It would be absurd to suppose that man has the natural right to form a creed for himself, according to his good pleasure. On the contrary, he is under a natural obligation to fol-

low only the truth. But this is an obligation between his conscience and God. It is unquestionably true that man has a natural right not to be forced by any human power to accept a creed; and the Church has always proclaimed this right in the words of St. Augustine: "*Nemo credit nisi volens.*" But, on the other hand, has man a natural right to regulate his life, and especially his exterior acts, according to the creed which he has freely embraced? Yes, if it be true; no, if it be false. In the latter case, if the individual be in good faith, he is excusable before God and his conscience; but even then, no matter how perfect his good faith, the civil authority has the right, as seen above, to hinder him from practices contrary to the natural law and to public good order. One may be in perfect good faith in practicing polygamy or human sacrifices; nevertheless, the law forbids them, and rightly. This principle is admitted in the United States, as elsewhere. It is manifest, therefore, that the right to enjoy one's creed is not as broad as some writers seem to suppose.

In fact, Mr. Lea immediately proceeds to dwell upon this class of facts as proving his very reasonable assertion that "no church can claim exemption from the law of self-preservation, which is supreme in all social and political organizations." This, he says, is the principle justifying all the "popular jealousy" against the Catholic Church, of which Mr. Dougherty complained. He details the action of the Government in regard to the Mormons as "a case in point," and alludes, in the same connection, to "the stern and sanguinary measures requisite in India for the suppression of the Thuggee, whose victims were immolated in honor of the awful goddess Kali."

Now it can hardly be supposed that even Mr. Lea's "jealousy" of the Catholic Church can go so far as to make him believe that these comparisons are just. And if they are unjust, as well as deeply hurtful to the proper susceptibilities of those against whom he is arguing, ought not the rules of decency in controversy to have restrained him from employing them?

He asserts that the Catholic Church resembles Mormonism in being "a theocracy" and "an *imperium in imperio.*" Let us see.

Theocracy is a word of vague and confused meaning in most minds, which many writers use as a bugbear. Once they hurl this awful word, the case is decided; reasons are unnecessary. Mr. Lea ought not to have used the term without defining it. Since he has failed to do this, we will do it for him. Etymologically, theocracy is the government of a state by God, as democracy is the government of a state by the people and aristocracy the government of a state by the nobles. It is evidently not a question of the general government of the universe by Divine Providence, but of

the special government of a given nation. Again, that the government of a nation may be said to be theocratic, it is not enough that the authority of the government should come from God, for that is true of the authority of all legitimate governments, and thus every legitimate government would be a theocracy. Nor does it suffice that the laws governing a society should have been given by God; Christ gave the laws of His Church, but He did not make it a theocracy, for it is not a state, but a world-wide spiritual society. Still less does it suffice that the state recognizes a form of religion and that its ministers take part in the government—as in England the bishops form part of the House of Lords; as in France, under her old constitution, the order of the clergy sat in the Parliament with the orders of the nobility and of the *tiers-état.* A government is theocratic when the nation is governed directly by God himself, who himself chooses his vicegerents, gives the laws and provides their sanction by a special providence. In all history there has been but one example of a true theocracy, that of the Hebrew people. The Catholic Church is not a theocracy because it is not a nation, because it is not a society organized for temporal ends, because, though it has received its authority and constitution directly from God, its government is not administered by Him, because it does not pretend to regulate the temporal affairs and political life of any nation in the world.

Is it then "an *imperium in imperio?*" There is an *imperium in imperio*—a state within the state—where there exists in the midst of a nation a political organization independent of the government. Thus in France, under Henry IV. and Louis XIII., the Huguenots, holding their own cities and fortresses, were said to form a state within the state. Thus the Jews, who are everywhere ethnographically and religiously distinct from the Christians, were they to form themselves into a political organization, would be an *imperium in imperio.* But the Catholic Church is not a state within the state, because, although it is a perfect society, yet it is not a society with temporal ends, but with spiritual and supernatural ends, to be attained by spiritual and supernatural means. A political society, a state within the state, it is not, and never can be.

"But," it is objected, "does not the Church meddle with political matters, and do you not in such cases hold that you are to obey the Pope first and the government in the second place?"

Catholics, we repeat, are the first to assert that religion and politics are quite distinct, that their authorized representatives have no right to transcend their respective limits and encroach upon the other domain. But the following points are to be carefully noted: It may well happen—it has happened a thousand times in history—that political measures may encroach on the domain of religion,

may attempt to regulate sacred things, may go counter to the religious convictions of the people. Ought religion and the Church then to keep silence? Will any reasonable man assert that a citizen ought to promise, or may in conscience promise, absolute obedience to any laws that his country may make, whatsoever in the light of conscience they may be? For that it would be necessary to hold that whatever the state may command is just; that the state is the source of all rights and its decrees the supreme rule of duty and of morals. But these are enormities not asserted, we are sure, by any one for whose judgment the country has any respect. If, then, in such cases, we hold that God and religion should be obeyed rather than political powers, and if, in fact, we hold that in all cases, whether of private or of public life, duty to conscience and to God must be the supreme rule of judgment and of action, we have no fear that in this we differ from our non-Catholic fellow-citizens. And beyond this the teaching of the Catholic Church does not and cannot go.

"But," insists Mr. Lea, "these instances (Mormons, Thuggee, etc.) illustrate the difficulty of drawing a hard and fast line of demarcation between secular and spiritual affairs. There is a vast field of human activity which may be classed with either group, according to custom or faith. We in the United States have reached a tolerably clear perception of what shall be held to be on either side of the line, and we manage, without much friction, to preserve the distinction between matters concerning earth and those concerning heaven. Yet our definition is very different from that of Rome."

Mr. Lea does not tell us according to what principle "we in the United States" have made this important distinction. He affirms, however, that it is different from that of Rome. So learned a writer ought, at least, to have stated clearly what is the American principle, and what the Roman. Then we could have seen whether there exists the alleged disparity between them. This much is surely called for by the serious discussion of matters of supreme importance. Since he has failed to do it, we will try to supply his deficiency, at least as far as the principles of Rome are concerned.

He who has the best right to speak in the name of the Catholic Church, Leo XIII., has clearly enunciated her principles in his encyclical, *Immortale Dei.* In the first place, as to spiritual affairs: "Whatsoever in human things is in any manner sacred, whatsoever belongs to the salvation of souls and the worship of God, is under the authority and rule of the Church." Let us analyze this principle, and we find that sacred things are limited to these five categories: (1) The foundation of the spiritual life is *faith;* it belongs therefore to the spiritual authority, and not to the state, to regulate what concerns the preaching and teaching of the Christian faith. (2). The sources of the supernatural life are the *sacraments;*

it belongs, therefore, to the Church, and not to the state, to regulate what concerns the administration and reception of baptism, the eucharist, etc. (3). The religious life manifests itself by the practice of good works, by acts of virtue, by the worship of God; it belongs, therefore, to the Church, and not to the state, to direct Christian charity, public devotions, the sacred liturgy, religious festivals, etc. (4). Preaching, administering the sacraments, public worship, require a sacred ministry; it belongs to the Church, and not to the state, to regulate the choice, the preparation, and the discipline of the clergy. (5). Finally, public worship needs church edifices and church funds; it belongs to the Church, and not to the state, to superintend their administration, this, of course, being done in conformity with the general laws of the country. These, then, are the matters considered spiritual and religious by the Catholic Church; who will say that they are not considered such by the American people?

Leo XIII. continues: "But all things else, being included within the civil and political order, are rightly subject to the civil authority." Let us, in like manner, analyze this principle, and see what the Church understands by temporal goods: (1). First, there are the goods of wealth; and it belongs to the state to regulate what concerns the acquisition and transmission of property, the management of commerce, industries, etc. (2). There are the goods of bodily health; the civil authority has the right to regulate the public hygiene, to erect and manage hospitals, etc. (3). There are the temporal goods of virtue, of public morality; and the civil authority has the right to take necessary measures for the preservation of morals, and for the suppression of crimes, not only those which attack persons, but also those which, like obscenity and blasphemy, shock decency, corrupt virtue, or assail religion. (4). There are, also, the temporal goods of intelligence; and the civil authority has the right to establish and direct schools,[1] to

[1] In Cap. XV., of the *Schema Constitutionis Dogmaticæ de Ecclesia Christi*, prepared for the Vatican Council, protest is made against the attempt to entirely secularize education, and exclude from it the influence of religion. The official annotation on this point of the *Schema* is as follows:

"Igitur tum in expositione errorum tum in affirmatione veritatis: 1. Non negatur jus potestatis laicae providendi institutioni in litteris ac scientiis ad suum legitimum finem, et ad bonum sociale; ac proinde etiam non negatur eidem potestati laicae jus ad directionem scholarum, quantum legitimus ille finis postulat. 2. Non asseritur potestati ecclesiasticae velut ex divina constitutione consequens auctoritas ad positivam directionem scholarum, quatenus in iis litterae et scientiae naturales traduntur. Sed 3. Vindicatur Ecclesiae auctoritas ad directionem scholarum, quantum ipse finis Ecclesiae postulat, adeoque asseritur jus et officium prospiciendi fidei et christianis moribus juventutis catholicae, hocque ipso cavendi, ne pretiosa haec bona per ipsam institutionem in scholis corrumpantur. 4. Hoc jus Ecclesiae in se spectatum non minus ad superiores quam ad inferiores scholas extenditur; unde hic,

promote the cultivation of the arts and sciences. (5). Besides all this, every nation has the right, within the limits of justice, to choose its form of government, to adopt the system of revenue which it thinks best, to recruit its army as it deems necessary, to conclude the treaties of alliance which it considers useful and proper. Again, this is the Roman view of the matter; is there anything in it that does not satisfy the most exacting American?

In these various classes of temporal and of spiritual interests, the points at which the two authorities touch most closely and are most apt to come in conflict are, obviously, matrimony and education. The divorce laws of the land are not in accord with the teachings and practice of the Church. But serious-minded lovers of the country are everywhere bewailing the laxity of the marriage tie, which, they say, imperils the very foundations of domestic and social life. The desire, therefore, that our laws concerning marriage were more in accord with those of the Church is not only loyalty to Rome, but loyalty also to our country's best interests. Our present system of school laws is also at variance with what the Church teaches concerning the system of education which ought to prevail in a Christian country. Not that the Church is opposed, as her adversaries constantly allege, to a State system of public schools. In this persistently repeated charge there is not a particle of truth. The quotation given above from the official documents of the Vatican Council proves the contrary. But the Church holds that the educational system of a Christian State ought to be Christian, ought to have Christianity in it as a pervading element. Not that she would ignore the rights or override the prejudices of Jews or of unbelievers. These are a very small minority, who could be dealt with in all fairness by exceptional

---

ubi de generali principio agitur, non videbatur distinctione opus esse inter diversas scholas. Ceterum per se clarum est, exercitium huius juris in applicatione ad diversos terminos necessario debere esse diversum."

(*Translation of same.*)

"Whether, therefore, in the statement of the errors or in the affirmation of the truth: 1. There is not denied to the civil authority the right of providing for instruction in letters and science, as required by its own legitimate end and the welfare of society; and accordingly there is not denied to the civil authority the right of directing schools, as far as its legitimate end demands. 2. There is not claimed for the ecclesiastical authority, as of divine institution, a right to the *positive* direction of schools, as far as letters and natural sciences are taught in them. 3. But, there is claimed for the Church the right of directing schools as far as the very end of the Church demands; hence, the right and duty is asserted of watching over the faith and morals of Catholic youth, and therefore of seeing that these precious qualities be not corrupted in them by the very sort of teaching used. 4. This right of the Church, considered *in se*, extends no less to superior than to elementary schools; hence, as to the general principle, no distinction had to be made as to different sorts of schools. But it is self-evident that the exercise of this right must necessarily differ according to the different limits within which it is applied."

provisions, but whose presence in the country ought not to debar it from being considered as a Christian country. Everywhere throughout the land, reflective minds who are able to catch a glimpse of the true state of the case through the mists of prejudice and the dust of political scramble, acknowledge that the only hope for America's future is in a deeper, more widespread, more practical influence of the Christian religion on the life of the American people, and that the only efficient way to attain to this is more Christianity in education, that is, in the schools. Just how to put this in shape, with a population divided like ours in Christian belief, is a problem of no little difficulty; but since the good sense of Canada, of England, of Belgium, of Prussia, has found the solution both advisable and practicable, there can be but little reason to fear that American good sense will find it impracticable. Meantime, Catholics are compelled by their conscientious convictions to support separate schools—not that they desire to hold aloof from the State schools, but because they feel bound in conscience to give their children a Christian education, which the present system renders it impossible for them to have in the public schools. Here again, therefore, the desire to make popular education Christian is not only loyalty to Rome but also loyalty to our country's best interests. In all these things we do not think and speak and write the less as Americans, because we think and speak and write as Catholics.

Mr. Lea next gives his views as to the origin and nature of the power of the papacy. His statements may be summarized as follows:

"It grew up in rude and uncivilized times; it then unquestionably rendered great service to civilization; it claimed and obtained universal control of human life, and overrode all merely human laws; the Pope was sole judge of his own authority; the bull *Unam Sanctam* defined it to be an article of faith that every human being is subjected to the Roman pontiff; thus all distinction was virtually lost between the secular and the spiritual spheres; the papacy had grown into a theocracy equally absolute over both; the exercise of this vast and undefined power was further complicated by the position of the Popes as Italian princes."

It would seem incredible that a man of Mr. Lea's pretensions as a scholar could be capable of putting this forth as serious history, had we not grown familiar with the warping power of prejudice. It is needless to tell intelligent readers that the power of the papacy over faith and morals and human life—the power given it by Christ, and which is alone essential to it, and to which all other prerogatives were but accidental and unessential additions—was fully recognized and fully exercised when the Roman empire still shone with the lustre of the Augustan age, long before the incursions of the barbarians brought rude and uncivilized times upon Europe. When those troublous times came, and the Church had

to be the civilizer of Europe, and peoples and princes everywhere gladly looked to her, and especially to her chief pastor, as the arbiter of their disputes and their guide in the paths of peace, neither the Pope nor the people ever lost sight of the distinction between the essential spiritual authority of the papacy and this temporal direction which circumstances accidentally demanded of it and imposed upon it. When the Popes did their duty to their times and to Christendom by asserting against tyrannical princes this directive authority with which Christendom had invested them for the public good, they never thought of obliterating the distinction between the secular and the spiritual spheres and of turning the papacy into a theocracy. The learned Cardinal Hergenrœther says, in his "Catholic Church and Christian State" (Essay I., part II.): "The Church has never declared it to be an article of faith that temporal princes, as such, are in temporal matters subject to the Pope. . . . . Great efforts, indeed, have been made to discover such a decision, and the Bull *unam sanctam* of Boniface VIII. has been brought forward as such. But in this bull it is only defined that all must give the due religious obedience to the Pope, not obedience in purely temporal matters." Again, if the sovereign spiritual authority is sole judge of its own limits, is not the same true of every sovereign authority? But it by no means follows that the Pope has any power to exaggerate his authority at will or to add to it even one iota. The limits of his authority are defined by the limits of sacred things, and further it has no power to go as by divine institution.

Nor is our critic any happier in what he says about the Popes as Italian princes. Their little temporal principality was meant by Providence simply as a guarantee of their spiritual independence, of the cosmopolitan freedom and impartiality of their spiritual jurisdiction; it had nothing to do with their spiritual authority in itself; and the struggles in which, for its maintenance, they too often had to engage with the restless petty princes around them had absolutely nothing to do with the great world-wide question now under consideration.

Having drawn his mistaken conclusions from his incorrect premises, Mr. Lea goes on to argue that they hold good now as in times past, and must continue to hold good for all time. His two reasons are the old, familiar, threadbare ones that the infallible Church can of course confess no errors and give up no claims, and that the syllabus of Pius IX. has put the Church hopelessly in conflict with modern civilization.

Can it be that a man of Mr. Lea's intellectual respectability should be so utterly ignorant of the Church's clear pronouncements on the nature and limits of infallibility? If he has not acquainted

himself with the subject, why should he write of it? and if he has acquainted himself with it, why does he so misrepresent it? The Church is infallible only in her official, definitive, *ex cathedra* teaching; she is infallible, that is to say, when she formally defines that such or such a theoretical or practical truth belongs to Divine Revelation. She is not infallible, that is to say, not impeccable, in her government. Hence, what the Church defines to be her right is infallibly such, and in this she has no errors to confess. But what this or that Pope may have asserted about his temporal rights is not infallible. Such assertions unquestionably have a strong presumption in their favor, but error in them is not impossible. Surely it is high time for writers to know the difference between infallibility and impeccability, and what the object of infallibility is.

Proposition 23 (not 22) of the syllabus is as follows: "The Roman Pontiffs and the General Councils have transgressed the limits of their authority, have usurped the rights of princes and have erred even in defining matters of faith and morals." From the condemnation of a complex and general proposition like this, what man at all acquainted with the laws of reasoning will infer the assertion that no Pope has in any case exceeded the limits of his authority or in any case infringed on the rights of civil rulers?

As a matter of course, Mr. Lea does not fail to mention proposition 80 of the syllabus, and he assails Cardinal Gibbons for having given echo to the Papal utterance on the subject. The words of the proposition are: "The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself with progress, liberalism and recent (*recenti*) civilization." Now what is the meaning of the condemnation of this proposition? Does it mean that all that constitutes modern civilization is condemned by the Pope? God forbid? As Leo XIII. himself, while still Archbishop of Perugia, so well wrote, we must remark the expression "*reconcile himself*." Under that vaguely indefinite term, "recent or modern civilization," there are included very many things—good, bad and indifferent. With what is good or indifferent in modern civilization the Pope has no need to reconcile himself; to say so would be an impertinence and an affront, just as it would be to say to an upright man, reconcile yourself with justice. With what is bad in modern civilization the Pope neither can nor ought to reconcile himself; so to assert would be a monstrosity. This is the very simple meaning of the condemnation of proposition 80. What reason is there for astonishment or complaint if our Cardinal, so devoted to his faith and so friendly to everything good in his age and his country, has given it echo?

Mr. Lea, quite unconscious of the sorry figure presented by his premises and conclusions, sums them up in the emphatic assertion that—

"The papacy of to-day is not simply a spiritual power, but possesses, according to the received doctrines of the Church, an indefinite jurisdiction over temporal affairs throughout Christendom, which can be enforced at pleasure. It is a political force. . . . . All citizens owe to him obedience in whatever he may command."

He goes on to include under this mythical despotism all baptized persons, whether Catholics or not, since St. Alphonsus teaches that they are all bound by the laws of the Church. Assuredly it is the teaching of the Church that all baptized persons are members of the body of Christ, which is His Church. Our Protestant brethren would have reason to think very unkindly of us if we taught otherwise. Naturally enough, we hold that every member of the Church is bound by the laws of the Church; though we also hold that ignorance and good faith in those who are separated from us as to external communion excuse them in the sight of God. And, in fine, we again utterly repudiate, whether for Catholics or for non-Catholics, the caricature of the Church's doctrines and laws presented by our good critic.

In support of his arraignment of the papacy, Mr. Lea takes us back to the days of Elizabeth and James, and finds a convincing proof of his case in the question of the "oath of allegiance" then agitated. He is a bold man, surely, to venture on such ground! For if ever in human history there has been an outrageous ignoring of the distinction between the temporal and the spiritual, a tyrannical trampling on rights of conscience, it was then and there. The oath of allegiance in no way set aside the oath of the royal supremacy in things spiritual, for the refusal of which Fisher and More and multitudes of others were put to death. Nor was the new oath meant as a test of Catholic loyalty. That had been proved not only by Howard of Effingham, but by the uniform conduct of the millions of English Catholics, and could not be seriously called in question. Its purpose was indicated by its title, "*Ad detegendos papistas*—for the detection of papists." Again, consider its phraseology and meaning. The Middle Ages were just drawing to a close. During all those centuries of turbulence, when usurpation and tyranny seemed to be almost everywhere the instinct of rulers, and when, as Mr. Lea acknowledges, the power of the Church was the chief source and conservator of civilization, it was universally considered that the deposing power, recognized by public law, was the main bulwark of popular rights against despotism. That it was, as a rule, used as such no impartial historian can deny. Now Catholics were called upon to denounce it, under the sacred sanction of an oath, as "impious, heretical and damnable." But that it was such, not only no Catholic, but no lover of the truth of history could swear. Mr. Lea is certainly unfortunate in the selection of his evidence, and more than unfor-

tunate in adducing this state of things as a parallel to what is or may be in our country or in our times. Again, let us hear the great historian, Cardinal Hergenrœther, on this point: "Pius IX. declared in plain and precise words, on the 21st of July, 1871, that of the various misrepresentations of the doctrine of papal infallibility the most malicious was the assertion that in the doctrine was included the right of deposing sovereigns and releasing nations from the duty of obedience. This right, his Holiness went on to say, had at times been exercised by the Popes in extreme cases, but had nothing to do with Papal Infallibility. Its source was not in the infallibility belonging to the teaching office, but in the judicial authority of the Popes. This latter, according to the public law then in force, and by the agreement of the Christian nations, who reverenced in the Pope the supreme judge of Christendom, extended to passing judgment, even *civiliter*, on princes and on individual States. Altogether different is the present condition of affairs, and only malice can confound things and times so different." (Css. I., p. III., n. 5.) Why cannot our good critics take note of such authoritative Catholic teachings, and thus spare themselves and their readers the trouble of wrestling with historical bugbears?

The next testimonies brought forward by Mr. Lea are those of the *exequatur* or *placet regium* and the *appel comme d'abus*. These are limitations put upon papal action by the civil powers; and since, in any disagreement between the two, the papal authority is beforehand presumed by Mr. Lea to be the guilty party, he naturally presents these acts of the civil power as measures of necessary precaution against papal aggression. The facts of the case are these:

The *exequatur* and *placet regium* had for their object to hinder the publication of papal documents and the execution of papal decrees till they had been examined and approved by the government. They had reference not only to measures which might have some semblance of encroachment on the civil domain, but also and even especially to matters purely ecclesiastical and spiritual, having only indirectly, if at all, a bearing on civil life, such as appointments to bishoprics, to parishes and other ecclesiastical benefices or offices, the publication of indulgences, ecclesiastical censures, disciplinary regulations, sometimes even dogmatic definitions.

For this interference with ecclesiastical administration various pretexts were alleged; but the real cause was, that tendency to absolutism, to Cæsarism, which characterized civil rulers more or less during the Middle Ages, but which especially asserted itself in the latter part of the fifteenth century, and throughout the sixteenth and part of the seventeenth. Let any one study the character and acts of a Henry VIII., an Elizabeth, a James I., a Louis

XIV., not to mention others, and the nature of this absolutism will be easily understood. They claimed that their regal authority came directly from God, without any mediation or participation or control. All representation of the nation in the government, towards which there had been a steady tendency under the influence of the Church, was gradually set aside, till there remained only the king and his council, and the monarch could say *l'état c'est moi!* They protested bitterly against the Catholic theologians who, like Bellarmine and Suarez, taught after St. Thomas, that civil power, coming from God, resided in the nation, and thence passed to the sovereign; and that, as it went from the nation to the sovereign, so, in case of tyranny, it could be taken from him. To these absolutists, the Church's teaching and the Church's spiritual authority were equally distasteful, and the tendency was everywhere manifested by them to take all ecclesiastical jurisdiction into their own hands. Even when they did not go so far as to decree themselves "Head of the Church by law established," they strove to make the action of the Church and her chief pastor entirely subject to the civil power. This is the true cause and explanation of the whole wretched business, no matter what the hypocritical pretences alleged by the despots. All this can easily be verified by any student of history, broad and fair-minded enough not to pin his judgment to the assertions of the prejudiced and unreliable Friedberg.

To-day, this odious invention of absolutism has been abandoned in most countries as both unnecessary and unjust. Belgium, Holland, Prussia and Austria abolished it. Italy abolished it in part. France kept it through the dishonest "organic articles" of Napoleon, but it is virtually a dead letter. Spain and Bavaria alone keep it in vigor. The government of the United States alone has never been disgraced by this meddling with ecclesiastical affairs, this confounding of the spiritual with the temporal order. Is it not, then, pitiful, that to-day, and in our country, an American should write the apology of this encroachment upon liberty of worship and rights of conscience, when its very authors show themselves ashamed of it?

He again warns us that "all this is not merely a matter of historical interest." And the reason, forsooth, why we need stand in fear of the same is the Bull *Apostolicæ Sedis*, in which Pius IX. inflicts excommunication on all who shall impede, directly or indirectly, ecclesiastical jurisdiction in either the *forum internum*, or the *forum externum*, or shall procure an appeal to the secular courts, or in any way aid or abet in such an attempt!

We may well ask, in wonder, what it can be that Mr. Lea finds to his purpose in the above-mentioned papal document. It contains only spiritual penalties, meant only for the protection of strictly

ecclesiastical functions, in the *forum internum*, that is in the sacrament of penance, and in the *forum externum*, that is in the ordinary government of a parish by its pastor, of a diocese by its bishop, etc. The prohibition of appeal to the civil tribunals has reference solely to matters entirely ecclesiastical and spiritual. The only visible reason for Mr. Lea's reference to such testimony as this, is that he must have been misled by the term *forum externum*, which he probably misunderstood to mean the realm of civil affairs, as distinguished from ecclesiastical to which alone it pertains.

He finds his next reason for dread of the intentions of the papacy in the old-time claim of immunity of the clergy from certain civil requirements, and especially from trial before civil tribunals. From the earliest days of Christendom it was universally recognized as proper and obligatory that clerics should be exempted from military service, and from any other civil requirements that would necessarily interfere with their sacred calling. It was considered eminently proper that, through respect for the sacred ministry, if a priest were guilty of any misdemeanor, this should not, to the dishonor of religion, be dragged before the public tribunals, but should receive equal justice before tribunals of a more private character, recognized by both Church and State. In proportion as Church and State have drifted apart, this privilege granted to the sacred ministry has been more and more set aside. That the army should have its own courts is most fitting, doubtless, in Mr. Lea's eyes; but that anything of the sort should be thought of for the honor of religion has for him but one meaning—disloyalty to the State. His assertion: "In Catholic eyes . . . . the ecclesiastic is a privileged being, under no obligation to obey the laws of the land (!!) and not amenable to them," is so utterly false and so utterly unwarranted, that it can only astonish and disgust.

He goes on to tell of several countries whose laws have been declared by the Holy See to be unjust, and in so far not binding. To him, of course, there is but one side to these cases, and the Pope is uniformly the agressor. He does not mention that it was only certain special laws that were thus condemned, first because of their being, in their letter and especially in their animus, direct attacks upon the Christian religion, and, secondly, because they were violations of *concordats*, that is to say, of positive contracts, thus contemptuously set aside. All this might have had some importance and weight with an impartial critic. With Mr. Lea it is all null.

He warns the American people that Catholic priests must not be allowed to interfere with elections. Is the minister of God, then, less a citizen of the state because of his position in the

Church? Or, is it allowable for all our gatherings of the various Protestant denominations to interfere, as they constantly do, with civil matters and political questions which they think in any way connected with morality and religion, but altogether wrong for Catholic divines to do the same? The fact, that in questions of morality and religion the Church throughout the world acknowledges a chief central teacher belonging equally to every tribe and tongue that God's providence brings into the one fold, has been sufficiently treated above. To connect the Pope with our American elections is worthy of a backwoods Puritan, but ought not to be expected in intelligent and serious men.

His misunderstanding also of the reason why the nations of the earth have had diplomatic relations with the Vatican, and his entire misconception of the meaning of a nuncio's office, cannot but fill one with astonishment. We are convinced that the bulk of the American people will not agree with him that the religious interests of the millions of Catholics in this country, or in any other country, are of so small account that the aims which the representatives of the Pope have in view must be political.

As to Mr. Lea's closing sentiment, we can confidently assure him that if "Old Catholicism," that is, the principle of *nationalism*, failed so dismally in Germany, where nationalism has ever had its stronghold, assuredly it has no chance of succeeding in our country, whose blessed privilege it is to wipe out all narrowness of nationalism, and to blend all nationalities in a national unity, like to the world-wide unity of the true Church of Christ.

ST. BERNARD AND HIS APPROACHING CENTENARY.

I.

IN the year of grace 1091, was born in the village of Fontaines, near Dijon, in Burgundy, a man who filled the first half of the twelfth century, up to his death in 1153, with the marvellous activity of a life all devoted to God, to the heroic pursuit of sanctity, to bringing about unity in the Church torn with schism, to effecting peace and concord between Christian princes, to the arduous labor of combating heresies within the bosom of Christendom, and to the still more difficult task of checking the progress of the Mohammedan power.

Appointed abbot in his twenty-fifth year, creating a great monastic establishment in the very bosom of the most frightful wilderness in his native land, and making it a nursery of such austerity and holiness, that its heavenly fragrance filled the whole earth, and induced all Christian peoples to possess one or more of its blessed offshoots, we find Bernard of Clairvaux even at twenty-five, and ever afterward until his dying day, so worn by his unappeasable thirst for penitential mortification, that people wondered how he lived at all. But the great and perpetual miracle was, that this feeble-bodied, emaciated monk was sustained by a spirit which enabled him to attempt and to achieve works so mighty and so various for the welfare of the Holy See and the universal Church, for the peace of Christendom and the revival of supernatural life in the cloister, among the clergy and throughout the population of Continental Europe—that nothing like the godlike deeds of this great saint has been recorded in the annals of the first twelve centuries since the Christian Era.

Nothing like his career, in very truth, can be found in the eight centuries which have elapsed since his great figure disappeared from the scene of his unparalleled influence and miracle-working power. The ten or twelve years which fill up, in the middle of the sixteenth century, the astonishing career of St. Francis Xavier's conquests and miracles, may alone furnish a point of comparison with the gigantic race which St. Bernard ran in the twelfth. These two, like St. Francis of Assisi and St. Dominick in the thirteenth, were glorious instances of the way which the Spirit of God, ever immanent in the Church, selects and governs His own instruments for the mighty purposes required by the special need of souls and the pressing dangers of Christian society at successive periods.

But to St. Bernard belongs the singular destiny, in the divine counsels, of having been all through his public life the poorest and most mortified of monks; the father of a numerous progeny of men resembling himself in self-sacrificing fervor and sancity of life, the chosen counselor of popes, emperors, kings, and princes; the arbiter in every international quarrel in his time; the man at whose voice inveterate schisms where healed, and the Roman Pontiffs secured in the allegiance of all nations; the divinely eloquent man whose words could arrest and quench the spread of the most baneful heresies, as the descending rain from the heavens extinguishes the fires on our western plains, or stops short the devastating conflagrations in our forests; whose sole appearance, even where the people understood not his language, could arouse all classes to enthusiasm, to repentance, to godliness of life, to heroic deeds and sacrifices—so potent, so irresistible was the divine virtue which went forth from that feeble body, from the very hem of the poor white Cistercian robes; so electric the fire which shot from those mild blue eyes and that pallid face all illumined by a light from heaven; so instantaneous was the effect of his words, even when addressing in his own native idiom, the citizens of Pisa, or Genoa, or Milan, the Germans of Strasburg, or Mayence, or Frankfort. It was the miracle wrought by the Holy Ghost when Peter addressed on the Day of Pentecost the multitudes assembled in Jerusalem from all lands in the Roman Empire. The Galilean fisherman spoke in his provincial dialect, but every listener among the thousands present understood him. Even so was Bernard understood when summoned from his cell at Clairvaux and what seemed his death-bed, to every realm or city in Christendom where triumphant schism, or some mighty local scandal, or spreading heresy, or the necessity of firing princes and peoples with ardor to save Palestine and the tomb of Christ from the Moslem, demanded the spell of his presence, his voice, his sanctity, and the never failing miracles which marked his passage.

What is there in the history of Christian Europe to be compared to this man, whose figure towers above prelates, princes, sovereigns, pontiffs and peoples, all of whom look up to the white robed, gentle and humble monk, as to one in whom dwelt, spoke and wrought the Spirit of Christ?

And now that the eighth centenary of St. Bernard's birth is near at hand in 1891, let us gladden the hearts of American readers by briefly recounting the phases of his most wonderful existence.

II.

Under God, whose providence directs the life of every man destined to fulfil a great and salutary mission, it is to the mother

of St. Bernard, the Blessed Alèthe de Montbard, that our Saint owed the early training which made him prize the heroism of sanctity above that of arms, which was the profession of his noble father, Tescelin-le-Rous (the red-haired), of his two elder brothers, Guy and Gerard, and of two of his younger brothers, Andrew and Bartholomew.

Tescelin was a scion of the Counts of Chatillon-sur-Seine, "an ancient knightly stock," says one of the Saint's biographers, "on which no stain of low extraction or *mésalliance* had ever fallen in its various branches from time immemorial." His wife, Alèthe de Montbard, was of a no less illustrious descent, the Counts de Montbard being nearly connected with the sovereign house of Burgundy. In their court, Count Tescelin held a high rank, and was distinguished by his wit, his brilliant valor and his wisdom in council.

Let us say it at once; not the least extraordinary circumstance in the life of St. Bernard is the fact that, after losing his saintly mother in his early youth, he won to the life of the cloister, and to the heroic pursuit of self-sacrifice and Christian perfection, not only his four brothers and his only sister, Humbeline, but his father, Tescelin, on whom the popular veneration, with the acquiescence of the Church, conferred, as it did on Alèthe and their daughter Humbeline, the title of "Blessed." We shall see in the course of our narrative what were the virtues and qualities of Bernard's five brothers, every one of whom, in due course of time, was led, by the fascination of Bernard's example and exhortations, to become his companion or disciple; Tescelin, at length, following his sons, and walking in their footsteps, and under Bernard's guidance, up the narrow way first trodden by Christ.

Such were the men who founded Clairvaux and who reposed in its lowly cemetery, mixing their dust with more than one generation of saints, when the great revolution of 1789–93 came to destroy the holy and beautiful places of France, and to cast out from their tombs the relics of God's saints.

The centenary of 1891, however, will find what remains of the Monastery of Clairvaux transformed into a prison for criminals, and a house of detention for political prisoners.[1] God is patient, because He is eternal, and will restore, in His own good time, Clairvaux to the Church of France, and will bless the surrounding vale with a spiritual springtide as fair in its promise as that which gladdened the souls of Tescelin and his children.

A glance now at the castle of Fontaines-lez-Dijon, the ancient

[1] The young Duke of Orleans, our readers will remember, was for some time imprisoned there, and he showed a Christian spirit worthy of a son of St. Louis, and a chivalrous courage and firmness befitting this sainted Crusader.

manor-house of Tescelin, and the birth-place of that Bernard, whose glorious name and surpassing merits are going to be celebrated in the Old World and the New during the whole of the next year.

For it is to Fontaines in particular that the Catholics of France and the surrounding countries are already preparing to go in pilgrimage a twelvemonth hence, during the month of August especially. Nor, we make no rash prediction in saying it, will travellers of Irish descent, from whatever land they come to France next year, fail to visit, not only Clairvaux, hallowed as the spot where their own St. Malachy died in the arms of the great abbot, his twin soul, where Bernard breathed his last, clad with the poor tunic of Malachy, and where both reposed in death, side by side, during so many ages, but Fontaines, where France in her present bitter trial is reviving in men's minds the memory of the sainted dead, and enkindling in the hearts of the rising generations the faith and piety which shall one day emulate the godlike deeds of eight hundred years ago.

"About a mile and a half to the northwest of Dijon," says the historian of St. Bernard,[1] "a traveller coming to the city from Langres beholds in the midst of a plain covered with fruitful grape-vines as with a rich carpet, rising up from this wealth of vegetation, the slender and graceful form of the hill which bears the ancient vilage of Fontaines. Along the slopes of this hill the houses cling, row above row, to the irregularities of the surface, while here and there trees and shrubbery diversify the prospect and lend to the whole both beauty and picturesqueness. Further up, the old parish church lifts its spire above the village; and higher still, on the very summit of the hill, shines forth, as a diadem, a structure of imposing dimensions, the architectural lines of which are those of a feudal castle. Under the modern additions made to these walls, as a jewel within a splendid casket, is the room in which St. Bernard was born."

One of the buttresses of the summit, on the southern side, plunges into a pond, which is formed by a spring of living water. This gave its name to the village of *Fontaines*.

From the esplanade in front of the parish church extends, on every side, one of the most magnificent prospects in France, in all Europe, indeed. A vine-carpeted plain spreads out like a sea to the Jura and the Alps, the snowy summits of which are illumined by the first rays of the morning sun and the last splendors of evening. Dijon, with its antique towers and its steeples, seems, in the early dawn or the late twilight, like a fleet at anchor in that sea at the very foot of the hill.[2]

[1] Chevallier, i, p. 2. [2] *Le Sanctuaire de Saint Bernard à Fontaine-lez-Dijon.*

At some distance from the church are grouped various buildings and remains of buildings of apparently different styles and ages. One would think, and think rightly, that the group formed, all in one, a fortress, a chapel, and a monastery, for there is the ancient feudal castle of Tescelin, with what time and the vandalism of the Revolution left standing of the seventeenth century[1] church of Reformed Cistercians (*Feuillants*) with their monastery, under the immediate protection of Louis XIII. The chamber in which St. Bernard was born had been converted into a chapel and become a place of pious pilgrimage before the foundation of the monastery. Thither St. Francis of Sales, and his heroic disciple, St. Francis de Chantal, loved to come and pray and refresh their souls.

The protection and generous patronage bestowed on Fontaines, its church and monastery, by Louis XIII., and his son and successor, were not withdrawn in the succeeding reigns. But the favor with which the establishment was treated was anything but a recommendation to the Jacobins of 1793. The monks were expelled, the church with the chapel of St. Bernard was stripped of every valuable they possessed, the monastery was torn down, the tower of the old feudal castle was half levelled, but the solid mediæval mason-work would only yield to powder, and the revolutionists had none to spend on the work of demolition.

A blacksmith put up a forge in one part of the church, the other was changed into a stable; and thus it fared with the buildings, till, in 1821, a pious lawyer of Dijon purchased the property, and covered in the church to save it from further ruin.

In 1840, the Abbé Renault, Vicar-General of the diocese, obtained possession of the buildings, and then began the period of restoration. Bishop after bishop helped on the blessed work. At present the establishment is the abode of a zealous body of diocesan missionaries, among whom is numbered Mgr. Henry Leneuf, formerly Vicar-General of New Orleans, and well known in New York.

The castle of the knightly Tescelin has been repaired and enlarged; the blessed room in which Alèthe de Montbard gave birth to her privileged babe has been purified, hallowed anew, and adorned as beseems so precious a sanctuary, while the monastery church of the Feuillants is arising, like the Phœnix from the cinders and ashes left behind by the Revolution, more beautiful and more stately than before.

The heart of Catholic Burgundy and that of all Catholic France, exhaustless in its charities, will not cease to pour out their trea-

[1] The *Feuillants*, or Reformed Cistercians, built a monastery at Fontaines in 1617. On January 6, 1619, the corner-stone of the monastery church was blessed with extraordinary solemnity.

sures until the native home of the greatest saint, and the most extraordinary man, ever born within her borders, shall be made worthy of his incomparable fame and of their undying gratitude.

Such, then, is the spot, in the very heart of the fairest portion of the kingdom of St. Louis, which is sure to be the chief centre of attraction all through next year's centennial solemnities.

Of the Cathedral of Troyes, which possesses in a magnificent monstrance the heads of St. Bernard and our own St. Malachy, and of the parish church of Ville-sous-La Ferté, which contains, enclosed in a modern shrine still more magnificent, the blended and well authenticated remains of the two sainted friends, we shall speak further on.

Let us now give our whole thought to the chief phases of the marvellous career filled by the first Abbot of Clairvaux.

III.

The blessed Alèthe superintended herself the education of her favorite son until he was between eight and nine years old. Then she placed him with the canons of St. Vorles at Chatillon, her husband's native city. The school directed by these canons then enjoyed a great reputation, and they were themselves widely famed not only for the learning, but for the edifying regularity of their lives. Chatillon was near enough to Fontaines to permit Alèthe to spend a great part of her time at her husband's castle in the former, and thus to watch over the progress made by her boy in knowledge as well as in virtue.

And, sooth to say, this twofold progress was extraordinary. The difficulties which delayed the intellectual advancement of learners of his age did not exist for Bernard. He soon mastered the Latin tongue, and delighted in reading the masterpieces bequeathed to us by the great writers of Rome, his teachers taking care meanwhile to keep away from him such works and such passages as might sully the mind and heart of one whose purity of soul had been so well guarded by his holy mother.

The piety of the boy was also a bright example for his schoolmates. It is related of him about this time, by his earliest biographers, that while watching in the canon's choir, on Christmas eve, for the solemn midnight Mass, Bernard was overcome with sleep and favored with a vision in which he beheld the Mother of God and her newly-born babe. This filled him with such love for both that he was regarded through all succeeding ages as the type of devotion to the Incarnate God and His Virgin Mother.

From this early age also dates the love of the Saint for the sacred Scriptures, the very soul of which is Christ promised in Eden and given to us in Bethlehem.

About the age of eighteen the young scholar returned to Fontaines to fulfil all the dearest hopes of his fond mother. She had long set her heart on seeing him devoted exclusively to the Divine service—on seeing him, indeed, a true follower of Christ in the arduous paths of self-sacrifice and crucifixion. Her own life, in so far as her duties as the mother of a large family and the mistress of a noble and numerous household permitted, was, in truth, one of perpetual abnegation. Inside her home she was worshipped by her husband, children and servants, and outside all regarded her as the mirror of all Christian virtues.

She did not, however, long enjoy the companionship of her best-beloved child. She suddenly sickened, and, forewarned of her approaching end, she summoned all her dear ones around her. It was at the very time when she was wont to celebrate with great solemnity the feast of St. Ambrosinian, August 31st, the patron of the manorial chapel, and to it were invited all the clergy of the surrounding country. The Lady Alèthe, though aware of her impending death, would have no change made in the festivities or in the hospitalities which accompanied them. She rejoiced rather that so many of God's priests were providentially assembled beneath her roof to help her with their prayers as she was passing out of this world.

So when the feast was over, at her bidding her guests, with her family and household, assembled around her deathbed. Tescelin, at the first warning given of her mortal danger by the wife who was the light of his life, would not believe that death was so near. Nor could her children, as she addressed to them her last motherly advice and bade them join in the prayers for the dying, bring themselves to think that she was about to be taken from them. Nevertheless, the last Sacraments were administered, the sublime prayers for the soul departing were recited by the assembled priests, while Tescelin and his children wept in consternation, grief and bewilderment. She, meanwhile, divinely informed of the nearness of her last moment, retained the fulness of her self-possession. Her right hand was raised in the act of forming the sign of the cross over her weeping dear ones, when the heroic spirit passed away. Hand and arm retained their posture in death, as a sign that all was supernatural in the light which had been given to Alèthe and in the prophetic announcement of her sudden but most saintly end.

This loss deeply affected Bernard. His two oldest brothers, Guy and Gerard, had embraced the military career, on which their father's valor and virtues shed so glorious a lustre; two of his younger brothers, Andrew and Bartholomew, were already candidates for knighthood. Nivard, the sixth and youngest of Tesce-

lin's sons, was but a child. Bernard, whose careful literary training and cultivated tastes disposed him to the pursuit of the highest knowledge and whom the examples and exhortations of his saintly mother inclined powerfully to renounce the world, was, after the death of Alèthe, like one suddenly forsaken by his guide, in a strange country and uncertain which road to choose among those opening out before him.

There were those among his friends who advised him to go to the most famous universities and there complete the circle of various knowledge he had acquired and contend for the palm of eminence in sacred and profane science. But others warned him that in the great European schools there were fearful dangers for such as he, reared in all innocence and the practice of all goodness beneath the watchful eyes of a mother like Alèthe de Montbard. Tescelin and his sons would fain have fired his soul with the military ardor and the noble ambition which filled their own. Guy was most happily married, and in his oldest brother Bernard thus beheld the Christian soldier and the Christian husband and father crowned in early youth with worldly honor and domestic bliss, while looking forward to a career of the loftiest distinction.

And so there arose before the young noble's eyes visions which dazzled, fascinated and shut out from view the arid heights among which lay the paths leading to self-renouncement and sanctity.

It is on record that one day while thus pursued by dreams of wedded bliss like that of his brother Guy, Bernard suddenly left the castle, and, coming to the half-frozen pond half way down the Hill of Fontaines, plunged into it and there remained till he had completely recovered the mastery over his senses and restored to his soul the peace it had lost.

This first effort toward victory over self was only the first step on that road which was to lead by degrees the youth of twenty to embrace what was most heroic in monastic life—the practice of perpetual self-crucifixion.

He only reached by degrees, by most painful and heroic efforts, the determination to do what the grace of God solicited him continually to do—to take up his cross and tread closely and unfalteringly in the footsteps of the MASTER.

He was impelled by a secret inspiration to visit the crypt of the Church of St. Benignus, in Dijon, where his beloved mother was buried. With his head laid on the tombstone which covers her remains, the young man wept and prayed, beseeching her help before God and beseeching God's light and guidance in the dreadful perplexities which troubled his soul. As the tears fell and the fervent prayers ascended, a voice seemed to come forth from the tomb warning him away from the world and its seductions.

At once he makes up his mind to choose "the better part." A few days after this visit to his mother's grave, Bernard is bidden to the fortress of Grancey, where his father and brothers, under the command of the Duke of Burgundy, are engaged in the operations of a siege. On his way, the youth enters a chapel by the roadside and kneels before a crucifix, beseeching from Christ enthroned on high, light and strength to follow Him. As he looks upon the image of the God of Calvary, the words uttered to the crowds in Galilee come to the suppliant's mind with overwhelming force: "Come to Me all you that labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you. Take up My yoke upon you and learn of Me, because I am meek and humble of heart, and you shall find rest to your souls. For My yoke is sweet and My burden light."[1]

From that hour Bernard took the cross and the Crucified to his heart. Never thereafter, until his dying day, did he seek his pleasure or his joy in anything else than the bitter-sweet of total crucifixion.

And what a spectacle to the Christendom of the twelfth century was the life which the blessed son of Alèthe thenceforward led! And with what wondrous power the Crucified invested this passionate lover of His cross!

It was to his mother's own brother that Bernard first addressed himself to win a first companion in the heroic spiritual warfare which he contemplated. This was Gauldry de Montbard, Lord of Touillon, a man still in the prime of life, wealthy, happily married, widely honored for his chivalrous character, and the austere purity of his private conduct. The nephew at first only consulted his favorite uncle on the determination to which he had come. But the eloquence of this youth of twenty, describing his own interior struggle and unearthly ambition which had lately taken possession of his soul, touched Gauldry deeply.

With all its feudal vices and social shortcomings, the twelfth century, like the eleventh, was an age of deep faith, when men had the courage of acting up to their convictions, and dared to realize in their own lives, at the cost of every sacrifice, the ideals of spiritual perfection revealed to them.

Gauldry felt himself irresistibly called to follow his young nephew and disclosed his purpose to his wife. It was the age, also, when wives armed their husbands for the crusades, and thus gave to the soldiers of Christ a double share of heroism. So the Lady of Touillon bade her husband go forth to the new crusade which Bernard was about to begin within the sacred recesses of the cloister itself.

---

[1] St. Matthew, xi., 30.

Bartholomew, who came in the order of age, second after Bernard, and whom their mother had impregnated with her own spirit of heavenly generosity, was the first of Tescelin's household to yield to the eloquence of the future Abbot of Clairvaux. Andrew, who was next in years to Bernard himself, and who had received the honor of knighthood, opposed a stout resistance to all the arguments of the latter. Not till Alèthe had appeared to him in a vision did the young knight, "from being a candidate for worldly fame, become a soldier of Christ."[1]

By something which much resembles a miracle, the two oldest brothers, Guy and Gerard, were won over. Guy, like his uncle Gauldry, was married and the father of two children. Everything which could fill the heart of man, in the present and in the prospects of a most brilliant future, induced the proud young noble to close his ears to his brother's arguments. Still Guy and his wife yielded to what must have been the call of God, he renouncing home and family to join his brothers, and she betaking herself with her young children to a convent. The eminent virtues which afterward distinguished both, proved that the hand of God had wrought the mighty change in their lives. Gerard, destined to be at Clairvaux his brother's most trusted counsellor and helpmate, was not so easily won as Guy, although Gerard was not bound by matrimonial ties and the claims of parental duty. It was only when stricken down in battle, by what seemed a mortal wound, that Gerard, lying at death's door, saw the vanity of all earthly glory and ambition, and vowed, if he lived, to join Bernard and his associates.

Humbeline and little Nivard were alone left to the widowed Tescelin in the Castle of Fontaines, which Alèthe and her seven children had filled, like a deep cup overflowing, with a happiness all the more intoxicating, that it had in it a foretaste of the joys of heaven.

He had not himself yet reached the age of fifty when this double bereavement fell upon his heart and his home. It will give us some idea of the magnanimity of the man, who, like his wife, deserved the title of blessed, that he at once yielded to Bernard's solicitation, and allowed him and his brothers, with their uncle Gauldry, to take possession of the ancestral halls at Chatillon, and there, undisturbed, give themselves up to the ascetic exercises which were the prelude of a monastic life.

Other chosen souls from their kinsfolk, their friends and acquaintances among the neighboring gentry, joined them in quick

---

[1] Guillaume de Saint Thierry, *Vita S. Bern. Et de Tirone Saeculi Factus est Miles Christi*, c. 3, n. 10.

succession, among these new recruits being Milo de Montbard, another brother of the Blessed Alèthe.

When the recluses at Chatillon had thus numbered thirty, Bernard, instead of founding with them a new monastic order, resolved to join the monks of Citeaux, a reformed branch of the Benedictines of France, founded not many years before by St. Robert of Molesmes, who was a blood relation both of Tescelin and Alèthe. The forest of Citeaux, in which Robert had planted the monastery, giving its name to the Cistercian reform, was plainly visible from the Castle of Fontaines.

In the early springtide of 1113, when Bernard was only in his 22d year, he quitted Chatillon with his companions, and came to pay a farewell visit to Tescelin at Fontaines.

Then was enacted a memorable scene. The widowed and noble soldier, in whose heart the love of earthly glory and the hallowed home-affections struggled with a secret yearning for the supernatural heroism practiced by his sons, received them and their associates with a stately courtesy. Were these pale-faced and poorly clad wayfarers the brilliant knights who so lately had stood by his side in the Court of Burgundy, or who had shared with him the perils of the foremost front of battle?

And were they to leave him and his home forever on the morrow? So if joy were mixed with his greeting of them, and with their conversation at table and throughout the evening, the parting on the morrow was unspeakably sad.

As they stood near the door of their paternal castle, Bernard was the first to kneel at his father's feet and to ask for a blessing on them all. The stout heart of the warrior was too full. He spoke no word. But while the tears coursed down his cheeks—an unwonted thing—he pressed to his heart in succession his sons, his brothers, and the remainder of the devoted band.

Humbeline clung to Bernard. She had been the confidant of his earliest struggles and temptations. But she was too young or too thoughtless to set a just value on the sacrifice he was then making. The little Nivard was clasped in Guy's strong arms. "My little brother," said the latter, "we are leaving you this castle and all our father's estates and honors. This is a great fortune for you." "Yes," answered the boy, "but they say that you are choosing Heaven where our mother is, and leaving me but earth. It is not a fair exchange."[1]

Tescelin amid the mist which dimmed his eyes saw the noble band of thirty—his own dearest on earth among them—turning their backs on Fontaines, descending the hill, and taking the road

[1] Guillaume de Saint-Thierry, *Vita S. Bern.*, c. iii., n. 17.

which led to Citeaux. His little son and daughter clung, sobbing, to him, while he, in this great bereavement, half envied his sons and kinsmen who had chosen the better way. Did the great heart of the widowed husband and father then feel, in this parting, the first promptings of the grace which later drew him also to cast his lot with Bernard and his companions? We may well believe that he did.

IV.

Citeaux and its saintly abbot were then in a desperate plight. A fearful epidemic was raging in the monastery, and had carried off more than one-half of the monks. Besides, the outside world which had loudly censured the extreme austerity of St. Stephen and his religious family, had little or no sympathy to bestow on their sufferings. And, moreover, Providence permitted that, for a considerable lapse of time, no novices presented themselves to recruit this first Cistercian community wasted by the preternatural rigor of their lives and decimated by a cruel epidemic.

Something like despair or at least discouragement, hung over St. Stephen and his monastery, when the Abbot was suddenly called to meet the thirty strangers knocking for admission at his gates. Stephen, during the bitter days which he had passed of late, had been favored with a vision in which he beheld one of the most exemplary of the monks cut off by the prevailing distemper.

"Father, put away all fear from your mind," the dead monk had said. "The life you lead here is pleasing to God. You who now weep over the few children left you, shall hear with your own ears these words of benediction: 'Our abode is too narrow for its inmates. Build for us a more spacious dwelling able to contain our increasing multitude.' Lo! novices are coming to you, and among their numerous bands are men of birth and genius. They will make of your monastery a hive sending forth its swarms on every side."[1]

For an entire twelve-month Bernard and his companions wore the secular dress they had brought with them to Citeaux. St. Stephen deemed that interval short enough to try their generosity in submitting to the life of crucifixion the rule required. But the austerities of Citeaux did not satisfy the soul of Bernard and his followers in their hunger and thirst for self-immolation.

Stephen Harding who united in his own person all the heroic and saint-like qualities to be found in the ancient monasteries of Great Britain and Ireland, was struck with wonder at seeing the progress in sanctity of Bernard and his brethren. Bernard, in particular, ran like a giant in the path of spiritual perfection.

---

[1] Chevallier, *Hist. de St. Bernard*, i, 54.

"Come to the cloister," says his historian, "to offer himself to God as a whole burnt-offering, he never made any reserve in his sacrifice of self, being ever impatient to advance higher, ever more and more given to complete the work begun, and forgetful of the road over which he had travelled to reach higher summits and wider horizons."[1]

Then, his bodily strength wasted by the penitential rigors which the young man of twenty-two practiced with such unearthly fervor, began for Bernard the bodily weakness which was to last as long as his life, filling all who saw him with wonder that he could work or live at all. "His stomach refused all food; his intense bodily pains made sleep impossible; the habit of standing erect or kneeling so long in prayer, had fearfully swollen the lower limbs. The folly of the cross (the passion for bodily austerities) had imprinted, here and there on the flesh of the novice, stigmata which became great wounds."[2]

His sole ambition is to make himself worthy of Christ crucified; and to deserve a closer personal union with the Lord of his love, he was constantly asking himself, when bodily strength gave way, or lassitude stole over his spirit: *Bernarde, ad quid venisti?* "Bernard, what brought thee here?"

In the impossibility of joining his brother-monks in the field-labor and other manual occupations, which filled so much of the time of the Cistercian recluses, he was allowed to devote himself to the study and meditation of the Scriptures. He so penetrated himself with the divine spirit they breathe and with the very diction of the sacred penman, that his beautiful style is made up of the Scriptural language. So that his perfect knowledge of the Revealed Writings, his intense love of the Word Incarnate and his Virgin-Mother, as well as his extraordinary gift of eloquence, have, in this unique diction of his, a ready and most effective instrument of instruction and persuasion.

In 1114 Bernard and his companions were admitted to make their solemn monastic vows. Perhaps it was about this time that the saint was ordained priest. Certain it is that in the beginning of 1115 the fame of Citeaux, thanks to the attention concentrated on it by the sons of Tescelin, their kinsfolk and friends, had drawn such numbers of the nobly-born and the generous of soul to the monastery, that the bees in the hive had perforce to swarm. The first swarm settled in the forest of Bragne, on the river Grosne, and was called La Ferté (*Firmitas*), because the wonderful increase at Citeaux was a confirmation of the reforms begun there and a promise of perpetuity. A second swarm settled between the

[1] *Ibidem.*, pp. 60-61.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

Seine and the Loire, under the leadership of Hugh de Macon, the schoolmate and beloved friend of Bernard. They founded the Monastery of Pontigny, so well known in English and mediæval history.

The third swarm, guided by Bernard himself, settled far to the north of Fontaines and Citeaux, on the left bank of the Aube, in a central position between Langres, Troyes and Chatillon. It was a densely wooded valley, walled in all round by lofty and precipitous mountains. The people far and near called it the Vail of Absinth (or Bitterness), "less on account of the bitter herbs that grew there, than because of the bitter sufferings and cries of the wretched travellers there surprised by bandits."[1]

The valley was a gift of Hugh, Count of Champagne. It was soon to be called *Clairvallcé, or Clairvaux*, "The Vale of Brightness," because of the physical transformation wrought by Bernard and his monks, and especially by the splendor shed on the whole country by the extraordinary sanctity of their lives.

It was, then, a wild forest wilderness to which Bernard was sent to found an offshoot of Citeaux. Building or habitation of any kind there was none. With him came to the Valley of Absinth, his uncle Gauldry, his four brothers, Guy, Gerard, Andrew and Bartholomew; his relatives, Godefry de la Roche, Robert and Ebold.

The new abbot's first care, on arriving in the valley, and after selecting the site for the monastery, is to mark out the cemetery, the site for the chapel and that of their dwelling. A shed or tent covered with branches shelters the newcomers from the inclemency of the weather, while they fell the forest trees and build as they may the walls of oratory and convent. They have no fear of the wild beasts that infest the surrounding mountains, nor of the wilder men who have hitherto made of this solitude a place of dread.

The historian does not say how the new community found means of subsisting while they cleared away the forest, reared the monastic structures and prepared the first fields for culture. But from the first day and night spent there by them, the echoes of the enclosing hills and the depths of the gloomy forest wilderness resounded to the voice of Psalmody. The Spirit of God was exorcising from the place the spirit of evil which had so long dwelt there.

The first winter spent there was appalling. The monks were compelled to seek among the nearest hamlets wherewith to keep off starvation. More than once they were left without the bare

[1] Guillaume de Thierry, *Life of St. Bernard*, c. 5, n. 25.

necessaries of life. Their sole clothing was a tunic of coarse white cloth with a cowl of the same color and material. The common dormitory was only covered over with rushes, through which the rain poured.

One day Gerard complained bitterly that they were come to the direst extremity. Bernard endeavored to calm his just apprehensions, and then went straight to the chapel to pray. While the abbot was still pleading at the mercy-seat, Gerard, who had charge of the temporalities of the monastery, was summoned to the gate, and there received an abundant alms which relieved their present need.

But it needed more than bread, or wine, or the warmth and creature-comforts of a home in the inhospitable wilderness to sustain these nobly-born recluses amid such desperate trials and privations. But the sublime spirit of self-sacrifice which animated Bernard, his examples more eloquent than his words, and his words glowing with the spirit of heavenly persuasion—all this, as every morning rose to try the perseverance of his companions, and as evening came only to bring fresh trials, made the young abbot of twenty-five like the Angel of God in the eyes of his brethren, treading before them the dizziest heights and beckoning them, with words of fire, to follow to where Christ awaited them.

In the midst of this suffering Bernard was careful not to let a day pass without feeding his dear companions with the word of God. Not satisfied with the sublime instruction contained in the Psalms and Scripture-lessons of the Divine Office which they chanted together with the most edifying regularity and fervor at the prescribed hours of both day and night, the Abbot of Clairvaux made it a sacred duty to give, every evening, one of those beautiful and soul-stirring homilies—a few only, comparatively, of which have been preserved to us. These were intended for the benefit of all, but more especially for that of the lay-brothers, who might not be able to read, and who had not had the advantage of any kind of literary culture. It was impossible to sit long at the feet of Bernard of Clairvaux and to listen to his sermons on the Feasts of the Church and his commentaries on the Books of Scripture, without being flooded with intellectual light and impelled upward to the highest sanctity. He was, most truly, the lamp of the sanctuary lighting up and warming all its recesses.

This marvellous eloquence of word and example was soon echoed beyond the limits of the valley. The illustrious scholar and prelate, William de Champeaux, Bishop of Châlons, heard of it, was drawn to Clairvaux, and there everything he beheld filled him with astonishment and admiration. But the wonder which most struck him was the young abbot, who, scarcely entered on

the springtide of manhood, was adorned with the learning, the wisdom and the virtues of a ripe old age—a saintly youth, who, in a wasted frame and with health seemingly ruined, displayed an energy all divine.

William de Champeaux at once conceived for Bernard a veneration and a friendship which only grew with each succeeding year. He prevailed on him to come to Châlons and preach in the cathedral there. The young abbot did not feel himself at liberty to refuse. The bishop's anticipations were more than fulfilled. The very sight of Bernard in the streets, his very appearance in the pulpit above the heads of the great audience, moved men's souls to their depths, even before the preacher had uttered a single word. It has been one of the mighty phenomena, accounting for the conversion of the pagan world to Christianity, that there is in the very presence of God's saints a spell so potent that it moves the masses with a resistless power. A virtue went forth from Christ which healed the sick and converted sinners, reaching, in its Divine energy, the very seat of physical and moral disease in body and soul. Peter, the chief of the Apostles, the leader of the sacred band entrusted with continuing Christ's mission, was, like his fellow-Apostles, clothed with that same virtue from on high. A word from his lips--the spellword "Jesus of Nazareth"—instantly cured the cripple at the beautiful gate of the Temple. The very touch of his garments, like those of the Master, had healing power. Nay, as in the miracles performed by Christ, so in those wrought by His Apostles and Disciples, the healing of the spirit, the entire change of the sinful heart, accompanied the healing of the body. More wonderful even than the spoken word or the touch of hand or garment were the miracles performed by St. Peter in Jerusalem, where they brought from all sides the sick and the afflicted, that the shadow of the Apostle might fall on them as he passed and restore them to perfect health.

St. Bernard, when he exercised his first Apostleship at Châlons-sur-Marne, was only at the beginning of a career filled year after year with prodigies wrought by the Spirit of God through this chosen instrument of His.

The popular multitude was moved by the eloquence of his evident holiness of life much more than by his words of electric fire, to give up their evil habits and thoroughly change their lives. To the extraordinary change wrought among the people corresponded that which took place among the ranks of the clergy, among the young nobility and the most distinguished professors and students in the surrounding university schools.

Clairvaux was too narrow to contain the numbers of recruits

who followed Bernard as he bade farewell to Châlons and its grateful bishop.

It was only the beginning of that apostleship which was soon to embrace the entire field of the Church.

But the saintly abbot, on his return to his monastery, instead of repairing his strength after the uncommon fatigues of his mission, was bent only on increasing the excessive austerities suspended somewhat during his labors in Châlons. His friend, the bishop, hearing that the abbot was lying at death's door, hastened to save a life so precious. For a brief space the sick man was forced to change his manner of living, and relieved from the government of his monastery. Only for a brief time, however; for the monks of Clairvaux yearned for the meek and gentle presence of their abbot, and could not be reconciled to a further privation of his inspired teaching and his heroic examples. So Bernard was once more left free to tread as closely as he wished in the footsteps of the Master up the road to Calvary.

In 1117 Bernard had the supreme consolation of welcoming successively to Clairvaux his young brother Nivard, and his father, Tescelin. The latter, who had just given his daughter Humbeline in marriage to the noble Guy de Marey, could not resist the prayers of Nivard, who asked to join his brothers in the Bitter Vale. Then Bernard went to his beloved parent, left all alone in the Castle of Fontaines, and prevailed on him also to give up the world for the cloister. Thus the six brothers were unspeakably comforted by having their father among them. And Tescelin soon proved that he was as generous in following his Crucified Lord as he had been in serving his royal master, the Duke of Burgundy. No one in all the great community now assembled at Clairvaux outstripped Tescelin in all the virtues which make monastic life the glory of the Church and the admiration of heaven itself.

We men of the nineteenth century look back with a half-incredulous, half-yearning wonder at this great home of sanctity in the blooming and blissful solitude of Clairvaux and feel ourselves fascinated by the spectacle of that multitude of white-robed monks, the great majority of whom are the noblest in the land, by birth and culture, and at whose head stand the gray-haired Tescelin and his six sons.

But the twelfth century was an age of feudal violence, pride, and corruption, which sorely needed in the cloister and in the Church the supernatural examples of Christian meekness, humility, poverty, and self-sacrifice, to bring back over men's lives the reign of God and His Christ.

Most blessed, in every sense of the word, was this Tescelin, the parent of an offspring as heroic as the Machabees, and destined to

restore the Kingdom of God throughout Christendom, to purify the Temple, to restore sacrifice in the Holy of Holies, and to drive the enemies of Christ beyond the boundaries of every European country save Spain.

Now admire how one poor monk, bearing in his person and his life the image of Christ crowned with thorns and crucified, can lift up the world around him, the peoples of an entire continent, to a higher spiritual life, to a knowledge and an imitation of the divine ideals which are the light and the life of a truly Christian society.

V.

No one who reads the life of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, and who is also well acquainted with the history of mediæval Christendom, but must know that the chief evils which were the bane of the religious and civil societies of these ages, were caused by the dominating and irresistible power of feudalism. Every one of the barbarian tribes which from the north of Europe or from Asia, conquered successively the provinces of the Roman Empire, imposed on the populations subject to them a well-ordered and uniform system of slavery or of serfdom. There were, at the origin, but two castes in each of the conquered countries—the warrior or free caste, and the serfs or slaves. The military caste elected the king, and he, once freely chosen, was the lord paramount of the entire territory won by himself and his followers. Under him the chief nobles and warriors of various degrees, held their *feuds* or landed possessions together with the serfs who cultivated the soil.

It took a long time to bring the conquerors—from the third and fourth centuries of our era—within the influence of the Church, which, even at this early period, had widely disseminated her belief, her morality, her lofty spirit of the equality and liberty of all Christian men as children of God. In the British Islands, as well as in the countries of Continental Europe, history attests how ruthlessly the barbarian invaders enforced their rule after having swept away the popular and religious institutions created by the Church before their coming.

Just in proportion as the civilizing and refining action of the Church was felt by converting, winning over, and enlightening these rude warriors, was the feudal pride toned down, the feudal yoke lightened for the oppressed, and the Christian notions of equality and liberty substituted for that monstrous hierarchy of tyranny and servitude—Feudalism.

This system was firmly established in the France of the eleventh and twelfth centuries to which St. Bernard belongs. Long before then the German emperors who succeeded Charlemagne, and the kings who ruled all Catholic Europe, claimed the right to nominate

to church dignities, because bishops owed the temporalities of their sees to royal gift, and were, as vassals of the suzerain bound to do him homage for the lands possessed by their church, and to receive at his hands the investiture of the fiefs thus held. The great nobles who built churches, founded rich chapters, endowed monasteries, or gave their lands for any ecclesiastical establishment, maintained their claims to nominate to the benefices thus created, and this claim became hereditary.

Thus it happened at the time when St. Bernard was born, and when he began to exercise on the public affairs of Christendom the unprecedented influence we are about to sketch, that there was not one great position or office in the Church of Christ which the reigning sovereigns of Europe and the great feudal families, did not endeavor by main and might to obtain for scions of their own, or for their own favorites and instruments.

The German emperors, who swore at their coronation to protect the Popes in the free and untrammelled exercise of their supreme pastoral authority, claimed, and were long allowed, a vote in the election to the vacant papal chair. When, at a later period, the right of electing the pope was restricted to the college of cardinals, then every crowned head or petty sovereign in Christendom sought to have as many cardinals as possible in the conclave.

We have said above, how sovereigns claimed, as an inherent right, to nominate to all ecclesiastical dignities and benefices. Bismarck claimed it for Prussia, and one of the hard conditions imposed on Leo XIII., by the then all powerful Chancellor, in exchange for a relaxation of the May Laws, was to give the government the right to veto the nomination of parish priests. This right with regard to all dignities and benefices is, and always has been, claimed in Italy by the usurping and persecuting Piedmontese government.

It is still exercised by the radical revolutionary government at present omnipotent in France. Nay, the British government has never ceased to claim it even in Ireland, and, as we know, until within the present pontificate, has managed in a great measure to exercise it.

Even in monasteries founded in the most frightful solitudes by St. Benedict, or by his glorious son, St. Bernard, the very wilderness which was abandoned to them by some great feudal lord, was, when generations of monks had made it as fertile and lovely as the garden of God, claimed as a feudal possession with the right of feudal patronage.

We are witnessing the growth of Clairvaux, and the transformation wrought in the Valley of Absinth by the toil of the heroic men who had followed Bernard thither. But long before Bernard's

time, Columbanus and his Irish monks had effected a like transformation in other portions of what is now France; they had been protected and favored awhile by kings and queens, and then, when the courageous old patriarch dared to lift his voice and rebuke royal cruelty and immorality, he and his were cast forth and driven from kingdom to kingdom till they settled in peace near the summit of the Ligurian Alps above the territory of Genoa.

Far otherwise fared it with one of the great Benedictine monasteries which had come after Columbanus. Cluny had been founded by a saint—Saint Mayeul. Its first and second generation of monks had also made of Cluny a spiritual paradise, and a garden of delight to the eye. It had sent its offshoots all over the land, till the abbot of Cluny came to be called "the Abbot of Abbots." The house itself grew, favored by the kings and their feudal nobles, till the monastery surpassed in size and splendor the palaces of sovereigns, and the church was, without comparison, the largest and most magnificent temple in Europe.

But with all these honors and this greatness, the spirit of feudalism entered into it, settled in it, and wrapped it round and round as with a double shroud, which shut out from the living corpse the vital air and heavenly light in which St Benedict and his companions were wont to revel.

The Abbot of Cluny became a great feudal lord, and then, Christ crucified and His spirit departed from this abode of worldly wealth and pride.

The reaction against this open departure from the heroic life of early monasticism, sent St. Robert of Molesenes and St. Stephen Harding to found Citeaux, and St. Bernard and his brothers to plant the Cross in the Vale of Bitterness.

The Cistercians, the better to distinguish themselves from the degenerate monks of Cluny, had adopted a white vesture, while the latter continued to wear the black robes of the Benedictines.

In 1125, William, Abbot of St. Thierry,[1] a monastery of the Cluny observance, prevailed on the Abbot of Clairvaux to write a defence of the Cistercian Reform against the slanderous rumors set on foot against it by the Cluny people. The decadence of the religious spirit in this great monastery and its dependencies was easily accounted for. "In 1109, on the death of St. Hugh, Abbot of Cluny, his pastoral staff passed into the hands of Pons de Melgueil, whose habits of worldly pomp and extravagance soon undermined the traditions of humility, laboriousness, and austerity which had been the life of the past monastic generations. Pons was deposed in 1122 by Pope Calistus II. (who was himself a

[1] This William of St. Thierry has left us one of the most authentic biographies of St. Bernard.

monk of Cluny), because Pons had, all of a sudden, left his monastery, and was leading a vagabond life in the world. Thirteen years of this bad man's baneful rule, had sufficed to relax all the springs of religious discipline, and to pave the way for a still greater moral ruin.

"Peter the Venerable, called to succeed Pons in 1122, had restored all the traditions of regularity and piety, which had raised Cluny to such a height of moral grandeur."[1]

It takes but a comparatively short time to make a breach in a dam, which for ages has kept in check the devastating course of a mountain torrent, while it will require long and combined efforts to repair the ruin in face of the raging, headlong flood. Peter the Venerable did much by his energetic rule and saintly examples to stop the downward course of religious life in his monastery. But the teaching and example of St. Bernard and his companions did far more. The ruin, however, was too deep and wide-spread to admit of any save a temporary restoration.

The "Apology" of St. Bernard appeared. It was a noble defence of the rule of St. Benedict. It reproved indignantly the rash spiritual pride and uncharitableness of such of the Cistercians as ventured to censure openly the faults of the Clunyites. More efficacious than all were the eloquent pictures the "Apology" drew of monastic life as contemplated and practised by St. Benedict, by the early Egyptian solitaries, and by the first generations of Benedictines, as contrasted with the splendor and luxuriousness of Cluny under such men as Pons de Melgueil.

In the mirror thus held up to them by one whose life was so Christ-like in every respect, the degenerate monks beheld with anger their own too-faithful portraiture. All were not angry, however; for all had not fallen away in idea or practice from the saintliness of their profession. If the stern denunciations of the Abbot of Clairvaux somewhat pained Peter the Venerable and the Benedictines who stood by him in his efforts to restore to their houses the beauty of holiness, the "Apology" greatly strengthened their hands in the work of restoration.

But others, besides monks, read the "Apology," and beheld in its pages not only the mirror of a true monastic life, but that of all the high and divine virtues which should adorn the secular clergy as well. There were great and salutary changes thus wrought among the most eminent ecclesiastics in France. The celebrated Suger, Abbot of St. Denis, near Paris, and the counsellor most trusted by the King of France, read the "Apology," and was so impressed by its inspired eloquence that he totally changed

[1] Chevallier, *Hist. de S. Bernard*, i., p. 143 and following.

the course of his life. He, too, like so many others, had allowed the spirit of feudalism to possess him and regulate his public and private conduct. Enjoying the rank and state of prime minister, Suger's household in the abbey was modeled on that of the king and his great vassals. The abbey was filled with armed retainers, crowds of nobles, and little room was left for the solitude, the privacy, the prayerful austerities of the cloister. Suger was wont to ride to the court of the king, arrayed in splendid ecclesiastical vesture, and surrounded by a numerous retinue of lords and armed knights. This, he thought, was only due to his rank and station.

After reading the "Apology," the Abbot of St. Denis, though retaining his position in the royal councils, became quite another man. He set to his monks the example of austerity of life, of scrupulous regularity in all things, and was thus enabled to bring them back to the full observance of monastic discipline. The armed retainers disappeared from the monastery, and with them the crowds of nobles and wordlings, the sumptuous entertainments, and the costly extravagance of worldly vesture and pomp.

The change had an extraordinary effect on other ecclesiastical dignitaries. More than one bishop read the glowing pages which had converted the Chancellor Suger, and followed his example.

And thus the movement of reform, extending itself beyond the walls of the cloister, reached the court itself, and the palaces of archbishops and bishops, the residences of rich beneficed clergymen, and spread downwards to all the ranks of the priesthood.

Kings, courtiers, prelates, councils, the popes themselves, and every great interest which drew the attention or stirred the heart of Christendom, demanded, thenceforward, from 1123 till 1153, that Bernard of Clairvaux should be the foremost personage on every great occasion, in every mighty difficulty or danger.

And the marvel is that this great man, whose wisdom, voice, and resistless influence controlled the policy of States and the deliberations of the most solemn ecclesiastical councils during all these years, was the same unchanged and unchangeable poor monk whom we have left in Clairvaux. Sick unto death apparently, so humble that he deemed himself always the greatest of sinners, so mortified in every sense that he never lifted his eyes to the low ceiling of his own poor cell, or knew not when they brought him a white horse, magnificently comparisoned, to enable him to reach the mountain solitudes of La Grande Chartreuse. Nothing could divert the eyes of his soul from the contemplation of that Divine Master and Model who ever hung before him on the cross.

Where is there in all history such an example of the way in which the cross, expressed in the life of one man, can lift a century and the civilized world up to God?

FRAY JUAN DE PADILLA, THE FIRST CATHOLIC MISSIONARY AND MARTYR IN EASTERN KANSAS. 1542.

WHEN Coronado made his unsuccessful attempt to colonize New Mexico in 1540, he was accompanied by four Franciscans: Fray Marcos, surnamed "of Nizza," then Provincial of the Order in Mexico; Fray Juan de la Cruz; Fray Juan de Padilla; Fray Luis, a lay-brother. The latter is called Fray Luis Descalona by Castañeda; de Ubeda, by Mota-Padilla.[1]

Fray Marcos did not remain long. He accompanied the expedition to Zuñe-Cibola only, and returned thence in the fall of 1540. Castañeda attributed his speedy return to fear, caused by the hostile attitude of the soldiery toward the priest, who, he claims, had deceived them by his exaggerated reports of the wealth and beauties of New Mexico. We have disposed of the calumnies of Castañeda elsewhere. The obvious reason of the friar's return was his feeble health. Hardships and physical suffering had nearly paralyzed the body of the already aged man. He never recovered his vigor, and died at Mexico, after having in vain sought relief in the delightful climate of Jalapa, in the year 1558.[2]

Fray Juan de la Cruz was already of advanced age when he joined the expedition. He was a Frenchman by birth, of the province of Gascony (Aquitania), and had worked as missionary in the district of Jaliscol. Of him it is said that Coronado held him in such high esteem as to give orders that every soldier should touch his hat or helmet whenever his name was mentioned.[3]

---

[1] Fray Geronimo Mendieta, *Historia Ecclesiastica Indiana*, p. 742, says there were five "Los Religiosos eran cinco." This is true, but only four reached New Mexico. The fifth, Fray Antonio Victoria, broke his thigh at three days' march from Culiacan, which he had left with Coronado. See Pedro de Castañeda, *Relation du Voyage de Cibola*, p. 39

[2] Compare our "The Discovery of New Mexico, by Fray Marcos, of Nizza," in the *Magazine of Western History*. Also, "La dé Couverte du Nouveau Méxique par le Frére Marcos de Nice," in the *Revue d' Ethnographie*. For the death of Father Marcos, etc, the sources of information aré numerous. Mendieta, who knew him personally, says of him, *Hist. Ecclesiastica*, p. 541, "y de los grandes frios que pasó, lo hallé yo cuando vine de Españo, morador en Jalapa, ga fo ó tollido de pies y manos."

[3] It is again Mendieta who conveys this information. *Historia*, p. 378, "Otro Francés hubo de Aquitania, llamado Fr. Juan de la Cruz, gran siervo de Dios y buen obrero de su viña;" p. 745, "Era religioso muy observante y de aprobada vido, y por ello muy respetado de todos; tanto que el capitan Francisco Vazquez Coronado tenia mendado á sus soldados se destocasen cuondo oyesen el nombre de Fr. Juan de la Cruz." Torquemada, *Monarchia Indiana*, edition of 1723, copies Mendieta.

When Coronado evacuated New Mexico in the spring of 1542, Fra Juan de la Cruz asked to be left behind, among the Tiguas of the present site of Bernalillo, on the Rio Grande. His request was granted, although everybody felt that sure death awaited the old man as soon as the Spanish arms would withdraw. The Tiguas had, after the protracted hostilities with the Spaniards in the winter of 1540–41, maintained a hostile attitude. The monk still hoped to succeed as soon as the military would have left the country. So he remained alone on the banks of the great water-artery which divides New Mexico into a western and an eastern half. He disappeared there. It is quite likely that the Indians murdered him, but as yet no positive statement in regard to his fate has been discovered. From the martyrologies we should conclude that his death occurred on the 25th of November, 1542. Gonzaga, who has written a short notice of Fray Juan de la Cruz, calls him an old man and a chorister.[1]

Fray Luis Descalona, probably a native of Ubeda, in Spain, also remained in New Mexico after Coronado's departure. Although loaded with years, he was but a lay-brother. He selected for his abode the great village or pueblo of Tshi-Quite, or Pecos (the Ciquique or Cicuye of Coronado's chroniclers). Thither he went, taking with him the remnant of the sheep which the Spaniards had brought to New Mexico and which Coronado had presented to him. Fray Luis built himself a little hut outside of the great pueblo and was living there shortly before the departure of Coronado. He told the Spaniards who came to bid him good-bye that the Pecos Indians were usually kind to him, but that, nevertheless, he expected to be killed by them. For, though the bulk of the tribe liked him, the wizards were bitterly opposed to his stay, and they would certainly put him out of the way sooner or later. Nothing was heard of him or of Fray Juan de la Cruz thereafter.[2]

---

[1] He is not mentioned by Castañeda, neither by Jaramillo, but Mendieta is very positive, p. 745: "Del siervo de Dios no se supo otra cosa mas de que quedó solo en aquel Pueblo de Tiguex (como que da di cho) para enseñar á los indios las cosas de nuestra fé y vida cristiana, de que ellos holgaron mucho, y en señal de regoci jo lo tomaron en brazos y hicieron otras demostraciones de contento. Entiéndese moriria martir." Matias de la Mota-Padilla, *Historia de la Nueva Galicia*, 1742, p. 112, mentions him. On page 167 he says: "Dejando, como prelado, lleno de bendiciones, á Fr. Juan de la Cruz;" p. 168: "Del padre Fr. Juan de la Cruz la noticia que se tiene es. Que despues de haber traba jado en la instruccion de los indios en Tigues y en Coquite murió flechado de indios, por que no todos abrasaron su doctrina y conbe jos, con los que trataba detestasen sus bárbaras costumbres, aunque por lo general era muy estimado de los caci ques y demas naturales. Que habian visto la veneracion con qué el general, Capitanes y soldados le trataban." See also Vetuncurt, *Menologia Franciscano.*

[2] Fray Luis is called Descalona by Castañeda-Cibola, and also by Jaramillo: "*Relation.*" Mota-Padilla calls him Fray Luis de Ubeda. As there is a place called Ubeda

Nor have we, as yet, been able to secure any tradition from the Indians touching their fate. Judging by subsequent events, it appears more than likely that they suffered martyrdom at the places which they had selected for their field of work. Of the sheep which Fray Luis brought to Pecos, all traces had disappeared when Espejo passed near the place forty years later. The Pueblo Indian, abandoned to himself, is careless with animals and cruel to them through neglect. This was still more the case in the sixteenth century than it is to-day. It is likely that the Pecos ate the sheep after killing the lay-brother.[1]

As yet no relics of any kind have been discovered in New Mexico that might be safely attributed to any of the missionaries here mentioned. Nor do the official ecclesiastic or other sources from the seventeenth century make mention of any such discovery. Of all the Pueblos, the Zuñis and the Pecos have probably the most definite recollections of what they call the "First Conquest." Still, in regard to the latter, it remains undecided as yet whether their traditions apply to the time of Coronado or whether they concern events of the permanent occupation of New Mexico by Jnan de Oñate in 1593.[2]

Fray Juan de Padilla was a native of Andalusia, in Spain, and comparatively a young and vigorous man when he joined Coronado's corps, or rather his Provincial Fray Marcos of Nizza. Yet he had already occupied important positions in Mexico. Thus he he was the first guardian of Tullant Zinco, whence he passed over to the province of Michuacan, where he became Guardian of the Convent of Tzapotlan, in Jalisco.[3] He gave up that honorable position to become a missionary in the unknown north. How many of his brethren have made similar and even greater sacrifices! How many of them have refused important and influential offices in order to seek and find death among savages! No sacrifice was too great for the missionaries, no danger too imminent. When the duty of converting and educating the aborigines called for them, they were always ready and glad to undertake the humblest mission, the most trying task.

It would appear that Fray Padilla was as strict as he was full of energy. In Coronado's camp he watched the conduct of the

---

in Spain, we infer that, as was frequently the case, the name of his place of origin was substituted. Of his disappearance at Pecos, all sources at our command treat.

[1] This was plainly shown by the action of the Pueblos after they had driven out the Spaniards from New Mexico in 1680. Three years later there was hardly a cow left, in the territory.—*Declaracion de un Indio Pecuri Que Dijo LLamarse Juan*, MSS., 1683.

[2] It is positive among the Zuñi, less so at Pecos, Jemez and Ibleta.

[3] Mendieta, *Hist. Ecclesiastica*, p. 742; Torquemada, *Monarchia*, vol. iii., p. 606 to 611; Vetancurt, *Menologia*, edition of 1871, p. 386.

men, and used to reprehend and punish severely all evil-doers.[1] A vigorous constitution admirably assisted a fiery, nay, an impetuous soul. It is known that Coronado preceded the bulk of his army to Cibola-Zuñi, and that all the ecclesiastics accompanied him. As soon as he was established among the Zuñis he sent an exploring party to the Moquis, at Tusayan.[2] Father Padilla accompanied the detachment of twenty men which Don Pedro de Tobar commanded. The Moquis (probably of the now ruined village of Ahuatuyba) refused to receive the foreigners, and met them in arms. Seeing that all endeavors to pacify the indians were unavailing and only increased their hostile demonstrations, also that retreat was practically impossible, Fray Padilla remarked to the commander, "Verily, I do not know what we have come here for." The soldiers heard this remark and immediately charged, dispersing the Indians. This opened the way to the Moqui Pueblos, who thereafter showed the most cordial dispositions.[3] Upon the return of this party Coronado sent another body of twenty men under the orders of Hernando de Alvarado to the east and F. Padilla accompanied it. It was on this journey that the Spaniards saw Acoma, the famous rock (Acuco), the Rio Grande at Bernalillo (Tiguex), Pecos (Cicuye, or Ciquique), and that they heard for the first time of Quivira.[4] Whether Fra Juan returned to Zuñi from Tiguex, or whether he remained with Alvarada at Bernalillo, we are unable to determine. After the whole of the little army had been gathered in winter quarters on the Rio Grande, and when the unjust and bloody war with the Tiguas was over, preparations began for the memorable journey to Quivira, in which Father Padilla, of course, participated.

We need hardly recall here that the incentive to that adventurous enterprise was furnished by the statements of a captive Indian, a prisoner among those of Pecos, and who claimed to have been born on the eastern confines of the great plains. He gave the Spaniards to understand that far away in the East there was a country or tribe called Quivira, which was rich in gold, silver, and other elements of wealth. This individual was surnamed by the

---

[1] Mendieta, p. 742.

[2] Tusayan is a corruption of Usaya, a name given formerly by the Zuñis to some of the principal Moqui Pueblos. Usayan is the possessive. Refrain from quoting on the deeds of Coronado, they being too well known.

[3] Castañeda, Cibola, p. 60.

[4] In the third volume of the *Documentos de Indias*, there is a report remitted jointly by Alvarado and Fray Padillo on the expedition to Pecos. It is incorrectly indexed. "Relacion del Viaje que Hernando de Soto y Fray Joan de Padilla Hicieron en Demanda de la mar del sur." It should be Alvarado. The document is very important, although Muñoz states he placed no faith in it. Muñoz had not been in New Mexico himself.

Spaniards the "Turk," on account of the manner in which he carried his head closely shaven with only a tuft of hair growing on the top of the skull.[1] This kind of head-dress is neither Pueblo nor Apache, nor Navajo. It would rather indicate that the Turk belonged to some branch of the Pawnees. However this may be, it is certain that the representations of the Turk made a great impression upon the minds of officers and men, and that they finally believed them. Everything seems to indicate that in the intercourse between the Spaniards and the Indian captive there was considerable mutual misunderstanding at the outset, but that also—after the latter saw that the white men placed upon his statements and signs an importance which to himself must have been a matter of surprise—he improved the opportunity to obtain a way of returning to his native tribe, and lastly, that there grew out of it a connivance between him and the Pueblo Indians for the purpose of getting rid of the Spaniards by sending them on a wild goose chase into the steppes where they were expected to perish. In short, Coronado was grossly betrayed. That the representations of the Turk about gold and silver rested on misconceptions is evident, for he could not judge of the chemical properties of metals; he had no idea of the difference between gold, brass or yellow mica-particles giving a glistening appearance to rocks, except from external appearance. No tribe north of Mexico, was ever found in possession of gold, with any definite conception of its value as a metal, still less as a medium of exchange. But neither were the Spaniards prepared to guard against such a misunderstanding. They had found gold in use at Mexico as an ornament. They were still under the impression of the reports from Peru and New Granada.[1] When therefore the Turk pointed to gold as a substance which he seemed to recognize they could not suspect that he was mistaken himself. So both parties were honestly deceived at first. But, after the Turk saw the importance placed by his white interlocutors upon the yellow stuff which they showed him and about which they inquired, he came to the conclusion that the opportunity was really a golden one for him to escape from a country where he had rendered himself unpopular, or which was unsympathetic to his tastes. He fomented troubles with the natives. When he saw that the Spaniards remained masters of the situation, he further exaggerated the wealth of Quivira; and when the Pueblos noticed that the unwelcome guests made preparations to leave, they naturally sought to induce the Turk (whose importance had grown

[1] Castaneda, *Cibola*, p. 72.

in their eyes) to favor them also by misguiding the strangers as much as possible and leading them to destruction.[1]

We have already mentioned that the Tiguas of Bernalillo had not become reconciled with the Spaniards. The Pecos also had some trouble caused by the slanders of the Turk. But these had been adjusted, and when Coronado left Tiguex on the 3d of May 1541, he marched directly upon Pecos, where he was received with open arms. Nine days after his departure from the Rio Grande he reached the great plains northeast of Pecos.[2]

The particulars of this eventful expedition need be but briefly stated here. Coronado had not a single hostile meeting with the Indians. He lost one or two men, but through accident, not at the hands of the natives, who, everywhere received him well and whom he in return treated fairly. He left the main body at the eastern edge of the great plains and went to Quivira with only twenty-nine horsemen, and probably Father Padilla. The main body returned to Bernalillo on the Rio Grande in advance of him. He reached there safely in August, but with empty hands. The march had resulted in a disappointment. Only a fertile country, much more fertile than any part of New Mexico, but thinly inhabited by roaming Indians, had been found. Discouragement followed upon disappointment. A severe contusion, resulting from a fall from his horse, gave to the commander a welcome pretext for abandoning New Mexico in the following year.[3]

For the purpose of this paper a careful examination of the route taken by the Spaniards on their trip to and from Quivira, and identifications of the localities and of the tribes met, are indispensable. Quivira was the place where, subsequently, Father Padilla sacrificed his life as a missionary. We must therefore ascertain where Quivira was, what it was, and what people were its inhabitants. The data at our command, while comparatively meagre, yet are still, perhaps, more complete than any yet brought to bear upon the subject, and we therefore don't hesitate in undertaking the task. Should subsequent investigations alter our conclusions or confirm them, we shall feel only too happy.

It is unimportant to determine the route followed by Coronado from Bernalillo to Pecos. From Pecos he marched to the northeast, and, after crossing a deep river, found himself on the plains on the 12th of May. The deep river was the Canadian. Between it and the Pecos village he had, according to the eye-witness, Jaramillo, crossed two creeks; one of these was the Rio Pecos, the

[1] Coronado. *Lettre A. L'Empereur Charles V.*, Tiguex, October 20-30 of 1541, p. 361.

[2] *Idem*, p. 355.

[3] It is superfluous to quote, since the events are too well known.

other the Gallinas. To cross the Canadian it was necessary to build a bridge. No other river, four days march northeast of Pecos, is wide and deep enough to require such preparations for its crossing."[1]

Beyond the Canadian the plains were reached, and ten days after the crossing had been effected the first Indians of the plains, the Querechos or Apaches (subsequently called Vaqueros), were met. Here the Spaniards changed their course from northeast to towards the rising sun, that is, almost due east. Very soon they met enormous herds of American bisons or buffalos.[2]

It is well to note this change in direction; it is also well to observe that soon the Spaniards found out that their Indian guides had lost their reckoning. It is a constant fact, that any one lost on the plains inclines to the right, and finally describes a circle. After thirty-seven days of march the Spanish army halted on the banks of a stream which flowed at the bottom of a broad and deep ravine. For several days past the appearance of the country had begun to change; a more exuberant vegetation had made its appearance, and Indian villages were met with whose inhabitants were clothed. There was in the Spanish troop one man especially charged with counting the steps in order to approximate the distances. According to his reckoning they were then, at the end of thirty-seven days, two hundred and fifty leagues or six hundred and seventy-five miles from Bernalillo. But this distance cannot be taken as an air-line. Coronado had marched to the northeast for seventeen days, thence first east, afterwards slightly south of east. We must also note that no other river had been met with since the crossing of the Canadian, except a small one at the bottom of a deep ravine, and which had been struck a few days previous. Owing to the direction and manner in which Coronado advanced, after crossing the Canadian, the only watercourse which he could have met at that distance was the Canadian again. The first stream was probably the north fork of that river, and the second, where the army came to a halt, was the main branch below the junction in the eastern part of the Indian Territory.[3]

---

[1] We hold that the crossing was effected south (or east) of the junction of the Canadian with the Rio de Mora. The Pecos river flows at a distance of three miles from the old Pueblo, and they had to cross it at all events.

[2] For the facts we refer in general to the numerous original sources. That the Querechos were the Apaches of the plains or Vaqueros, who afterwards became known under the different names of Carlanes, Natajees, Lipanes, Cuartelejos, etc., is established by Espejo: *Relacion Del Viaje.* See our *Report on Studies Among the Indians of the Southwest.* 1890.

[3] The change in direction of the route is mentioned by various writers Going first northeast from the Canadian below its junction with the Mora, carried the Spaniards into Colfax County, New Mexico, thence east with inclination to the southeast,

The place was occupied or roamed over by an Indian tribe which is called the Teyas. Who these Indians were we cannot attempt to decide. They tattooed themselves, either with paint or by incisions. This custom would tell in favor of their being the Jumanos, a semi-sedentary tribe shifting to and fro across the eastern part of New Mexico at the time. Leaving this matter undecided we must remark, that the Teyas signified to Coronado that his guides had led him completely astray, the Quiviras being far to the north of the place. Castañeda adds that those guides had led Coronado in too southerly a direction: "Too near to Florida." This is a further confirmation of what we have said, namely, that the Spaniards marched like people losing their reckoning on the plains, in a circle or arc of a circle, first northeast, then east, afterwards even south of east.[1]

At this place Coronado left the main body, and with twenty-nine horsemen, and probably Father Padilla, struck out for Quivira. He moved northward, and at the end of about forty days (the number is variously given) a large river was reached, which he crossed to its north bank and followed its course to the northeast for upwards of twenty days. Finally turning to the north inland, he reached, after sixty-seven days of short marches and occasional delays, the region called Quivira. The great river north of the Canadian can only have been the Arkansas, and they struck it at some point below Fort Dodge, whence the river flows to the northeast. It is noteworthy also that Jaramillo states, while going in that direction, they descended the course of the stream.[2]

It is, therefore, in northeastern Kansas, perhaps not far from the boundary of Nebraska, that we must look for the homes of the Quiviras in the years 1541 to 1543. The descriptions of the country furnished by Coronado himself, by his Lieutenant, Jaramillo, and (from hearsay) by Castañeda, agree very well with the appearance of that country. As long as they remained south of the Arkansas the land was one great plain without timber and very little water;[3] north of the Arkansas its aspect changed. Coronado says: "The province of Quivira is situated nine hundred

---

to the north fork of the Canadian. Crossing it, they naturally travelled to the banks of the main river near the central portion of the Indian Territory.

[1] The Teyas were found too far to the east to be the Jumanos. Still there is a possibility at the present day that the Jumanos (reduced to a mere fraction) live in northeastern Texas and the Indian Territory. They are mostly confounded with the Comanches. That the Jumanos lived on the eastern plains is abundantly proven.

[2] For the short marches we refer to Jaramillo, *Relation*. That the Arkansas must have been the stream in question is manifest. There is no great river between the Canadian and the Arkansas. The latter makes a sharp turn to the northeast east of Fort George at Great Bend, and continues to flow in that direction for quite a distance.

[3] Coronado, *Lettre à l'Empereur*, p. 353.

and fifty leagues from Mexico, where I came from, and in forty degrees; the soil is the best that can be found for all kinds of products of Spain; for in addition to being strong and black, it is well irrigated by brooks, by springs, and by rivers; I found prunes like those of Spain, nuts, excellent grapes, and mulberries."[1]

Jaramillo says: "This country has a superb appearance, such as I have not seen any better in all Spain, neither in Italy or France, or in any other country where I have served your majesty. It is not mountainous; there are only hills, plains, and brooks with very good water. I am completely satisfied with it. I presume it must be very fertile, and favorable for the raising of all kinds of fruit. As for cattle (herds) experience proved that it is very convenient; considering the multitudes of animals that are met with, and which is so great it can only be imagined. We found prunes of Spain of a kind that is not completely red, but similar to red prunes; there are also black and green ones; it is certain that the tree and the fruit are the same as those of Spain. Their taste is excellent. We found, in the country of the cows, flax, which grows wild in small tufts isolated from each other, and as the wild cattle don't eat it, the stems and blue flowers are visible; although small, it is good. On some brooks sumac is found similar to that of Spain; and grapes of fair taste, although wild."[2]

Castañega says: "The plants and fruit resemble those of Spain; there are prunes, grapes, mulberries, etc., etc."[3]

We forbear further quotations, and only call attention to the great similarity of the vegetation as described, with the wild plants of northeastern and eastern Kansas.

The appearance of the Indians, however, was not in accordance with the richness of the soil and of its vegetable products.

Castañeda: "The natives do not cultivate them (the plants which he enumerated), because they ignore their properties. Their customs are the same as those of the Teyas, and their villages resemble those of New Spain. The houses are round, have no halls; the stories resemble lofts. The people sleep under the roofs, where they also preserve what they have; these roofs are of straw." In another place he remarks: "The Indians of that country had neither gold nor silver, and knew nothing of such metals. The chief wore on his breast a copper plate, which he prized very much."[4]

Coronado: "I had been told that the houses were of stone and with many stories. Not only are they of straw, but the inhabitants are as wild as any of those I had seen until then. They have no mantles, nor cotton to make them with. They merely tan the

---

[1] *Idem*, p. 360. [2] *Relation*, p. 378. [3] *Cibola*, p. 194. [4] *Ibidem.*

hides of the cows which they hunt and which are dispersed about their village, near a large river. They eat the flesh raw like the Querechos and the Teyas; they are at war with each other. All these people resemble one another. The inhabitants of Quivira are the best hunters. They grow maize. . . . In all the provinces and all the country I have gone over, I have not seen, nor have there been metioned to me, more than twenty-five villages, the houses of which are all of straw. . . . The natives are tall; some of them above average size. I found some of them as high as ten spans (palms) in height. The women are well formed. Their features have a Moorish rather than an Indian cast. The natives gave me a piece of copper which one of their chiefs wore suspended to his neck. It is the only (piece of) metal which I saw in that country." Further on: "What I have been able to find out is, that in all this country neither gold nor any other metal is found. I was only informed of small villages, the inhabitants of which, for the greatest part, do not till the land. They have only huts of hides and of reeds, and change their abodes with the cows."[1]

Jaramillo: "The houses of these Indians were of straw, many of them circular, the straw descending to the ground like walls. They do not at all look like ours. Outside and on the top there is a kind of chapel or loft, with an entrance, where the Indians could be seen seated or lying down."[2]

All this proves that the Quiviras were Indians of the plains, living chiefly from the buffalo and from very limited agriculture, changing the sites of their hamlets as the bison moved to and fro. Neither do they appear to have all been of one stock. Says Coronado: "The diversity of languages spoken in this country is extraordinary; every village has its own. We suffered greatly from the want of interpreters, for I was compelled to send officers and horsemen in every direction to find out if anything could be done in your majesty's interests. Although the most diligent search was made, no other inhabited country could be discovered but this one, which amounts to but very little."[3]

And yet, notwithstanding these and other very positive statements, Quivira became fifty years later a golden phantom, a delusive spectre, important in the end for the increase of geographical knowledge, fatal to all who undertook to grasp it. What we

[1] *Lettre*, p. 354, *et seq.*

[2] *Relation*, p. 379. He also says, p. 376, that the village of Quivira was built by the side of small but pretty brooks, all of which flowed into the great river Arkansas. "Il y avait, autant que je me le Rappelle, sik ou sept villages séparés les uns des autres; nous fimes route pendant, quatre ou cinq jours sans les quitter, l'intervalle compris entre l'un et l'autre ruisseau n'est pas habite." The last one of these villages was called Quivira.

[3] *Lettre*, p. 360.

have had occasion to say of it elsewhere we repeat here: It is for the North American southwest what the myth of El Dorado proved to be in South America.[1]

It is not the place here to follow this digression, but we may, having located the Quiviras at the time of Coronado, ask to what tribe the Indians thus called, belonged? The name Quivira was probably not the one they gave to themselves. Outside of New Mexico, that is, among the numerous tribes of Indians west of the Mississippi, it seems to have been unknown. Still we find, in 1725, on the upper Red river, the Quirireches, a village of the Canceys or Kansas.[2] The general drift of all the Indian tribes ranging between the Mississippi Valley and the mountain region of New Mexico has been, within the past three centuries, from north to south. Many have disappeared, and the Quiviras seem to have shared that fate. In the beginning of the seventeenth century, we find them in southern Colorado.[3] Thirty years later in eastern New Mexico, still later in northeastern Texas.[4] After 1700 they faded out of sight. But while the Quiviras were still roaming over southern Colorado and western Kansas, Spanish writers bring them in connection with the Tindanes.[5] The word Tindan recalls a Spanish form of the word Thinthon or Thinthontha, used in the latter half of the seventeenth and in the eighteenth centuries, to designate the extreme southerly branch of the Dah-co-tas or Sioux; the Teton-Sioux; also called "Gens des Prairies."[5] That the Quiviras were a northern stock is quite likely. That they were not a numerous band seems proven. The suggestion is, therefore, not out of place, that they may have been an outlying band of the great Dahcota stock who, gradually drifting further south in the course of little less than two centuries, finally merged into one or the other of the tribes, either of Texas or of the Mississippi Valley. The exaggerated accounts of their numbers and wealth are thus disposed of by Fray Alonzo de Posadas in 1586:

"Many pretend to say that the Quiviras consists of many cities; that the one particularly so called is one of them, and that all are rich in gold and silver. On this point it seems that the information is more liberal than truthful, since neither our Spaniards

---

[1] *Journal Historique de l'Etablissment des Francais à la Louisiane*, p. 200, 212.

[2] This we infer from the statements of Juan de Oñate about his expedition to Quivira in 1599; from Geronimo de Zarate Salmeron: *Relacioner of* 1626, MSS.; from Fray Alonzo de Posadas. *Informe al Rey Sobre las Tierras de Nuevo Mexico, Quivira y Teguayo*, MSS., and Torquemada, *Monarchia Indiana*, vol. i., p. 673, *et seq.*

[3] Posadas, *Informe;* Francisco Gomez, *Carta al Virrey*, 1638, MSS.; Juan Domingo de Mendoza, *Diario de la Jornada a Los Jumanos*, 1684, MSS.

[4] Zarate Salmeron, *Relaciones de Todas las Cosas.*

[5] Hennepin, *Description of Louisiana;* published by Mr. Shea. On the map there is in latitude 50 north, Thinthonha ou gens des Prairies. Compare also p. 200.

nor any of the Indians who border upon that nation affirm to have seen any metal that came from that country. . . . . And as for the cities which they represent as being so populous, and some of them so extensive as to cover leagues, while it is certain that there are many people, they are settled in the manner following: Every Indian has his dwelling, and adjacent to it his garden plot and field, on which he raises and harvests his crops. Thus the settled expanses appear very large, without containing, however, the population attributed to them."[1]

Having located the Quiviras in 1541, and suggested at least what they probably were, I return to Fray Juan de Padilla. It is not unlikely that he accompanied Coronado on his trip thither. Jaramillo says, at least, that he "wished to return." The "Relacion Postrera de Sivola" positively states he went with Coronado, and that document was written by one (possibly by a priest) who was in New Mexico at the time.[2] At all events, when the Spanish corps, discouraged, disgusted with New Mexico, and dissatisfied with its commander, left the banks of the Rio Grande, Fray Juan de Padilla remained behind with Fray Juan de la Cruz, one Portuguese soldier named Andres Docampo, two "Donados" from Michuacan, called respectively Lucas and Sebastian, and some Mexican Indians. It is positive that no other Spaniard or soldier, except the three priests and Andres, remained in New Mexico in company with the Portuguese, the two Donados and two Indians from Mexico, also with a Mestizo boy. Father Padilla left the site of Bernalillo for Quivira. He took along the most necessary equipments for saying Mass; probably a few provisions, and at least one horse. The date of his departure we cannot find, but it must have been in the summer or fall of 1542.[3] Of the route taken by the little band, we only know that they passed through Pecos, where Fray Louis was already established; but we can surmise that they did not follow the trail of Coronado and of the main body. Coronado himself tells us that he effected his return from Quivira in thirty days, and that he brought with him Indians who served as guides. It is probable, therefore, that the latter led him, Indian fashion, in a line as straight as possible; that is, from northeastern Kansas to the southwest, through that State, and possibly through the southeastern corner of Colorado into New Mexico.[4]

---

[1] *Informe al Rey.*

[2] *Relacion Postrera de Sivola y de Quatrocientas Leguas Adelante*, MSS., contained in the Libro de Oro y Thesoro Indico. A still unpublished manuscript of Motolinia, in possession of Don Joaquin Garcia y Cazbalceta at Mexico.

[3] It appears that Andres Docampo alone went on horseback. The others, including the father, were on foot. These details are given by Jaramillo, Castaneda, Mota Padilla, and later authors also.

[4] Coronado, *Lettre.*

It is likely that Fray Padilla took the same route, even if he was not guided by Quivira Indians, a point which I do not venture to affirm or deny.[1] Certain it is that they reached the Quiviras without hindrance, and that they were well received. Coronado had caused a large cross to be erected in or near one of their villages or hamlets.[2] This cross was, for the missionary, a starting point for his labors.

All went on well for a time until the priest decided upon leaving the tribe and laboring temporarily, perhaps, among another group of natives.[3] This was highly imprudent on his part. His intentions were of the best, but he was not sufficiently conversant with Indian nature. A missionary who has been well treated by one tribe cannot leave that tribe without exposing himself to suspicion and jealousy. The Indians looked upon the priests as upon powerful wizards. They looked upon ceremonies of the Church as magic performances, from which they expected the same and greater material benefits than those which they derived or believed they derived from their own practices of sorcery. The more popular a missionary became, the more dangerous it was for him to change his field of work. Such was the case at Quivira, and the danger was still greater from the fact that, as Coronado tells us, the people were often at loggerheads with each other. By leaving his first place of abode Fra Juan de Padella exposed himself to the double danger of being looked upon by his first acquaintances as a traitor who abandoned them in order to impart to others the benefits of his wisdom, and, by those to whom he went, as an enemy coming from people with whom they were at war.

Castañeda says that the friar intended to go to the Guyas, a tribe with whom the Quiviras were at war, and that the latter therefore killed him.[4] Jaramillo gives no such account. He attributes his death to the cupidity of the Quiviras, and states, besides, that Indians from Tiguex (Tiguas) had instructed them how to perform the deed.[5] The most detailed account of the event so far found is in Mota-Padilla, who, although an author of the eighteenth century, still deserves consideration from the fact that he examined original sources yet unknown to us. He states: "The Friar left Quivira with a small escort, against the will of the Indians of that village, who loved him as their father. But at one day's journey he was met by Indians on the war-path, and, knowing their evil intentions, he requested the Portuguese to flee, since the latter was on horseback, and to take with him the Donados and the boys, who, being

[1] *Idem.* He says that he brought Indians from Quivira with him. It is therefore likely that they returned with the friar and the Portuguese.

[2] Coronado, *Idem.*

[3] All the main sources seem to agree on that point.

[4] *Cibola*, p. 194.

[5] *Relation*, p. 381.

young, were able to run and save themselves. Being defenceless, they all fled as he desired, and the blessed father, kneeling down, offered up his life, which he sacrificed for the good of the souls of others. He thus realized his most ardent desire—the felicity of martyrdom by the arrows of these barbarians, who afterwards threw his body into a pit and covered it with innumerable rocks. The Portuguese and the Indians, returning to Quivira, gave notice there of what had happened, and the natives felt it deeply on account of the love which they had for their Father. They would have regretted it still more had they been able to appreciate the extent of their loss. The day of his death is not known, although it is regarded as certain that it occurred in the year 1542. . Don Pedro de Tobar, in some papers which he wrote and left at the town of Culiacan, states that the Indians had gone out to kill this blessed Father in order to obtain his ornaments, and that there was a tradition of miraculous signs connected with his death, such as inundations, comets, balls of fire and the sun becoming darkened."[1]

Vetancurt, in his "Menologio," places the death of Father Padilla in 1544, and on the 30th of November. We prefer to follow Mota-Padilla as to the year, for he is more in accordance with the two contemporaries, Jaramillo and Castañeda.[2]

The news of the fate of Fray Juan Padilla was brought to Mexico many years afterwards, though certainly previous to 1552, by the Portuguese, Andres Docampo, and the two Donados, Lucas and Sebastian.[3] The return of these three men—unarmed, destitute and unaccompanied by any one—from northeastern Kansas to Tampico, on the Mexican Gulf, finds a parallel only in the wonderful journey of Cabeza de Vaca and his three companions from eastern Texas to the Pacific coast. Were the fact not established beyond a doubt, it might be looked upon as a fairy tale of old. But it is indisputably proved by official testimony. As to the details of their remarkable journey, none of the sources at our command have much to say. Both Herrera and Gomara state that the Portuguese and his companions were captured by the Indians and

---

[1] *Historia de la Nueva Galicia*, p. 167.

[2] *Menologio*, p. 386. Artur von Muenster, in his *Auctarium Martyrologii Franciscani*, 1650, p. 637, gives no year. He calls the Indians at whose hands the monk perished, "Herzinalen:" "est er endlich von et lichen wilden Leuthen (welche man Herzinalen nennet) mit Pfeilen dur chochossen worden."

[3] Both of these "Donados" were from Mechuacan. The name of Andrés, the soldier, is mostly written Del Campo, but since he was a Portuguese, it must have been Do Campo. That they returned previous to 1552 is proven by the fact that Gomara mentions it in his *Crónica*, which was completed in that year.

remained in the power of their captors for ten months, after which time they fled. It is also stated that a dog accompanied them.[1]

Of the two Donados, Sebastian died very soon after his arrival at Culiacan. The other became a missionary among the tribes of Zacatecas, where he died at an advanced age.[2] Of Andres Docampo nothing further is as yet known.

May we be permitted to transcribe here what, on another occasion, we have written on the deaths of the three Franciscans, whose sad and at the same time glorious end the above pages have related?

"They were never heard from again. Such is the funeral oration—simple, but pathetic from its very simplicity. Of these, the two old monks, Fray Juan de la Cruz and Fray Luis, remaining alone in the newly-discovered land, happy to conclude their days there in whichever way it might be, provided it was in the service of their Lord and Master and for the honor and glory of his name.

"The end of Fray Juan de Padilla was different. As his life had been of a more vigorous cast, so his martyrdom sounded high through the land. His sepulchre in Kansas has never been found, but it is noteworthy that from Mexico, as well as in later years from New Mexico, all attempts on the part of the Spaniards to penetrate beyond the region where his death occurred have signally failed. That region is the same where the hardiest pioneers of Catholic civilization coming from the south met, figuratively speaking, the pioneers of Catholic civilization from Canada. The tomb of Fray Juan de Padilla, therefore, marks not a *ne plus ultra*, but the point where the two standard-bearers of Catholicism came together to join both ends of the advance of Catholic faith across the North American Continent."[3]

---

[1] Neither Jaramillo nor Castañeda mention the dog. Compare Gomara, *Crónica*, and Herrera, *Historia General.* The latter is usually very reliable, as far as careful compilation goes.

[2] Mendieta, *Historia Ecclesiastica;* Vetancurt, *Menologio*, and others.

[3] *Histoire de la Colonisation et des Missions du Sonora, Nouveau Méxique, Chihuahua et Arizona, Jusquà l'an* 1700 (MSS. at the Vatican). We refer here particularly to the expedition of Pedro de Villazur to the banks of the Platte River, where nearly the whole of the Spaniards perished, at the hands of the Pawnees and French, on the 17th of August, 1720. A monograph on that expedition will shortly appear in the papers of the Archæological Institute of America. The notorious Jean L'Archévèque, the betrayer of Lasalle, perished in that massacre.

ARE CATHOLICS RIGHT?

THE above question it is opportune to ask regarding the position of Catholics on the ever-important subject of discussion, the schools. It is especially opportune at this time, in view of the very strong feeling against Catholics in certain quarters, and of the virulent attacks made on them, with more force of words than wealth of wisdom. Hardly a day goes by without our being treated to some unfavorable criticism, in which Catholics are accused of being disloyal, and hostile to the best interests of our country, because they do not send their children to the public schools, and persist in building their own school houses, and in educating their children as they conscientiously believe they ought to. Who is right, our critics or we? This is the question we propose to answer.

Before we answer it, let us not be misunderstood. We admire exceedingly the zeal for education everywhere manifested amid our people; for education is the process by which man's mind is to acquire the truth—its connatural object and food—and by which the heart is to be directed to the attainment of all that is good, which it seeks by the tendency placed in it by the Creator. This zeal is everywhere to be met with; in the village, in the large city, and in important meetings of educators, in which able teachers compare their views, the proceedings of which we not only read with interest but often find valuable suggestions.

We are in sympathy with all these workers in the great cause. It is often a source of great pleasure to us when we find, as we have more than once, these clever people coming so closely to the systems our Catholic forefathers approved, and advocating, after long experience, the methods which have made the great and learned scholars of the past. Among these we may note the condemnation of putting any strain upon the intellect of tender childhood; the cultivation of the memory; simplicity in early instruction; the moderation to be observed in the number of studies, and in the amount; the explanation by the teacher of what is difficult before the child is made to learn it; the inculcation of the importance of not letting the pupil pass further on till he thoroughly knows what he is engaged on; the importance of following nature, and of not requiring what is above capacity; the grading of classes, and other like measures which an experienced teacher finds suggested to him by the circumstances of the case. In all

such investigations the friends of education will find Catholic educators interested co-workers; and we doubt whether any of them could write as learnedly and as correctly on the subject as the distinguished member of the Order of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, Brother Azarias, in his recent article in the *Ecclesiastical Record*, of Philadelphia. We feel especially indebted to him for what he says of Blessed de la Salle, the founder of that Order; and of St. Joseph Calasanctius, the founder of the Order of the Fathers of the Pious Schools. The former of these two illustrious and saintly educators of the children of the people, flourished in the latter part of the seventeenth century; the latter antedated him by fifty years. Before Raikes had begun his Sunday schools, these had been doing far better; and with a century and a half start of him, certainly the Catholic Church is ahead of other churches in this race; and, strange as it may sound to prejudiced ears, is ahead in higher education; though we willingly grant that the United States has outstripped all other nations in the general, ordinary education of the child, defective though it be in the most important point; but of this presently.

To make our answer more intelligible, we must call attention to the state of the educational problem at the present time. Owing to a condition of things which the present generation did not bring about but must accept as it is, there exists a very wide-spread difference of opinion on all points, especially that of religion, in meeting the general need of education. This conflict of ideas has led the majority in this country to look upon a school system from which religious education must be excluded as an absolute necessity. We think it but fair to attribute this to honest conviction, however much we regard it as a mistake. There are other and subtle influences at work to make this idea more far reaching and permanent, and of these we shall speak.

The feature to which we first call attention, is the tendency which the system displays to supersede the duty of parents, to usurp their rights, to make the state the supreme disposer, if not owner, of the child. Herein lies a most serious and fatal error. What the state is for is not to supersede individual right, but to safeguard right, and never to hold rights in abeyance unless the public good call for such action. Rights are sacred things, especially those natural rights which the genius of our American institutions teaches us to regard as inalienable. All government, legitimately instituted on a foundation of justice, has its authority from God, who gave those natural rights. It must, therefore, represent Him, and, representing Him, must not contradict Him by depriving the citizen or subject of the rights the Creator implanted in man's nature. Hence the proper object of all legislation is to

protect right, and the decisions of the Supreme Court look to the rights of individuals and of the States as defined by the limitations of the Constitution, and thus safeguard liberty. In the logical order right comes first, because inherent in man; while a state becomes possible only by an aggregation of men. This makes evident the gross error those commit who worship the state, make it everything, and, like Hegel, exclaim, "The state is the really present God." Making a god of the state is the death of liberty; and against any such assumption it becomes American manhood to rise in just indignation. We, of all others, knowing that our liberty rests, and must rest, on justice, should be ready to give willing obedience to the authority which God has bestowed on men, and as ready to resist the abuse of authority, and oppose the hurtful measures of shortsighted or malicious men that propose in the name of authority.

Among these inherent rights is most assuredly the right of the parent to his child; a natural right, for it has its foundation in the fact of birth. The parent, therefore, is the owner of his child, and this ownership, when rightfully exercised, has no limit but the right of the creator. This right involves the right of the parent to educate his child in his duties to his Creator, and to do so is an obligation inherent in the parent, who must discharge it according to his conscience. Any interference with this is a violation of the rights of conscience. It may be answered that there is no intention to do this, to interfere with such sacred natural right of the parent in having a state system of education. But, when the system is, practically, godless and rears a generation without knowledge of God and of Christian morality—which cannot be taught apart from religion—it is idle to disclaim any such intention; the result is too patent, and shows the mistake. Parents who are religious, whether Catholic, Lutheran, Episcopalian, or Methodist, are justified in agitating in favor of religious training, and because they cannot have it in the public school are fully justified in establishing schools of their own. They are simply exercising their own God-given right, and protesting against a violation of it.

But there are equally grave, if not graver, reasons for the action which looks to the vindication of this parental right. It requires no great foresight to understand that whoever can control the education of the child will have him in his maturer years; who has the child will have the man. This is so well appreciated that it forms part of the programme of naturalism which, in Europe, seeks to destroy the idea of revealed religion. Recently, a very bold and impudent move in this direction has been set on foot by the Freemasons of Italy, and a circular has been sent out by them through the length and breadth of the land commanding their fol-

lowers to seize on and hold possession of *elementary education*, and supporting this command by the presentation of the grounds upon which it is based. Considering the affiliation of Freemasonry in the United States with that of Europe, is it idle to suppose a common purpose, and a word of order passed from mouth to mouth to cripple and destroy the influence of divine revelation in the school? Some of the men who took part in the Giordano Bruno celebration are prominent in their hostility to religious training in the public school, and the German "Turners" have lately thrown their weight in the balance in favor of the Republican scheme to interfere with the German parochial schools of Wisconsin. It will repay the trouble of watching the utterances of the Masonic press of the country; we do not think we risk anything in saying that the Masonic press will be found to a unit in favor of what has been termed "the Godless system of elementary education."

It seems to us that a further insight into the details of the system of public-school education in this country will throw additional light on this subject. At the head of the Bureau of Education, at Washington, has been placed a gentleman of ability, but of well-known pantheistic ideas, Prof. W. T. Harris, A.M., LL.D., of the Concord School. This gentleman was in the habit of lecturing on philosophic subjects at Indianapolis and at Terre Haute, Indiana. Having, it would seem, no one to counteract his hurtful opinions, he spread them widely, so that the Indianapolis *Journal* called attention to the fact that the normal schools of these two cities were saturated with pantheistic teachings. Prof. Harris went to the well-springs and poisoned them. He perverted the teachers, and the children confided to them will be poisoned too. Latterly the professor, active in his work and "wise in his generation," has made use of the influence of the position which political favor has given him, and has edited the "International Educational Series," one of which, Rosencranz's "Philosophy of Education," with a preface by him, and also a commentary on the whole, which is designed for the work of instructing teachers, is before us.

In this work, Prof. Harris informs us of "the stubborn individuality of the martyrs" (p. 249). On page 250 he tells us: "All external authority should be cancelled in the self-rule of spirit, which is a law unto itself. The divine authority of the truth of the individual will is to be recognized, but at the same time freed from its estrangement toward itself. While Christ was a Jew, and obedient to the divine law, he knew himself as the universal man who determines to himself his own destiny; and although distinguishing God, as subject, from himself, yet holds fast to the unity of man and God. The system of humanitarian education began to unfold from this principle, which no longer accords the highest

place to the natural unity of national individuality, nor to abstract obedience to the command of God, but to that freedom of soul which knows itself to be unconditioned by aught in time or space."

Page 254 he tells us Protestantism is "a necessary element of Christianity," and "Monachism (the religious life of the monk) has a defect as measured by the entire scope of Christianity; it re-named the world instead of conquering it"; it was, he says, "the mechanism of a thoughtless subjection to rule."

Page 255–6, Prof. Harris declares: "Christian monachism resembles in many of its forms that of Buddhism. Their vows, poverty, chastity and obedience, indicate the attitude towards the secular world. The three chief secular institutions: (a) the family is attacked by the second vow, which aims at celibacy; (b) civil society, or the institution for the production and distribution of property, is attacked by the first vow, which renounces property; (c) the state is attacked by the third vow, which renounces allegiance to any but its religious superiors."

We close our citations from this book by the following language at the expense of the Jesuit educators: "The most deliberate hypocrisy and pleasure in intrigue merely for the sake of intrigue, this subtlest poison of moral corruption were the result. Jesuitism had not only an interest in the material profit which, when it had corrupted souls, fell to its share, but it also had an interest in the educative process of corruption. With absolute indifference as to the idea of morality, and absolute indifference to the moral quality of the means used to attain its end, it rejoiced in the efficacy of secrecy and the accomplished and calculating understanding, and deceiving the credulous by means of its graceful, seemingly scrupulous moral language." "Penitence and contrition were transformed into a perfect materialism of outward actions, and hence arose the punishments of the Order, in which fasting, scourging, imprisonment, mortification and death were formed into a mechanical artificial system."

We will not tire the reader with matter of this nature further. It shows sufficiently what kind of influence is at the helm of the public elementary education of the United States.

There was placed in our hands some time ago a list of questions to be answered at a "teachers' institute" in Southern Indiana. They were mostly taken from Carlyle's "Heroes and Hero-worship." No one will deny the rugged sincerity of Carlyle nor his ability. But are his views on subjects vital to us to be taken as matter of examination on which Catholic teachers are to answer, and which the teachers in general are to have held up to them as their principles in educating Catholic youth? Luther he lauds as *humble* and *peaceable;* Tetzel "plies a *scandalous trade* in Indul-

gences," in consequence of which Luther's penitents tell him in the confessional that "they had already got their sins pardoned;" while Leo X. "*seems to have been a pagan.*" "Popehood has become untrue. The thing is untrue; we were traitors against the Giver of all truth, if we durst pretend to think it true." Swinton's book can take its place alongside of this. The Boston Committee of One Hundred must be happy. It is all about as reliable as what they put forth. One of their latest publications is by the Rev. Mr. Dunn, in which he makes an onslaught upon the Church, and quotes "Schouppe's Manual," as claiming for her a power of dispensing from the laws of the State. On looking at Schouppe's words we find he is speaking of dispensation from *ecclesiastical* law, and cites decrees of Councils to show this, as is perfectly proper. Thus we see continual misrepresentation at work among those holding power to injure the Catholic Church, warp the mind of American youth, and destroy the respect of Catholics for their faith.

Is it strange, then, that we say most positively that Catholics are right in their attitude as respects the public schools? It would be passing wonderful if they took any other; it would be a mark of moral decay, of waning vitality, did they not protest in the vigorous way in which they do, and will continue to do, claiming unhesitatingly and persistently their just rights.

But let us say a word to strengthen our position, and not content ourselves merely with a denial of the assumptions of our adversaries, or with rejecting their schemes.

It is well known that the Catholic prelates in the United States have recognized the need of Catholic schools, and have passed decrees to bring about everywhere the erection of parish schools. The principle upon which they acted we find very ably proclaimed by the distinguished Archbishop of Dublin, Most Rev. Dr. Walsh, in a discourse on the 7th of last November, at the Medical School of the Catholic University. There is not enough difference in the state of things in Ireland and in America to make what the Most Rev. Archbishop says inapplicable in any way to our case here. We quote copiously, that there may be no danger of misunderstanding the position of his Grace.

"When Trinity College was, in a sense, secularized in 1873, the position of Catholics in reference to the three Queen's colleges then existing in Ireland was thoroughly well understood. The fundamental principle of the system of education embodied in those colleges was one that made it impossible to regard them as a provision for university education, available, in any practical sense, for the Catholics of Ireland. Save in some special and exceptional circumstances, it could not be considered open to Catholics. I speak now, of course, of Catholics who are sufficiently instructed in the nature of the obligations to which they are subject as Catholics, and who are also conscientiously desirous of fulfilling these obligations. Of such Catholics, I say, it could not not be considered really open to them to make use of the advantages which the State, through these well-endowed colleges, placed fully and freely within the

reach of the members of every Protestant denomination in Ireland. The reason of this is obvious. To us Catholics it comes as a matter of fixed principle that every such institution, embodying that which is known as the 'mixed' system, is from the nature of that system, a source of danger to Catholic students, if they frequent it: a source of danger, in the first place, to the vigor and even to the integrity of their faith; a source of danger also to their constancy in the full and faithful observance of the practical duties by which they are bound as Catholics. That is what we mean by the expression dangerous to faith and morals. That is what the Church has always meant, as often as she has, under that severe censure, condemned as places of education for Catholics, institutions such as the Queen's colleges, whether existing in Ireland or in any other portion of the universal Church.

"Even if no such condemnation had been issued, common sense would have sufficed to warn us of the danger. Let me quote to you a noteworthy expression of a former venerated member of our Irish Episcopacy—Dr. Moriarty, formerly Bishop of Kerry. In a letter to one of the numerous commissioners that from time to time have sat in Ireland to examine and report upon our public educational institutions, Dr. Moriarty wrote as follows of the official Training College of the National Board in Marlborough Street. His severe strictures upon that college as a place of 'mixed' education for our school teachers are, as you will observe, quite applicable to the case of 'mixed' colleges of university education. Dr. Moriarty, in fact, himself remarks that this is so. Here is what he wrote: 'The condemnation of the Queen's colleges by the highest authority in the Church necessitated the condemnation of the Training College by the Bishops. The cases are perfectly parallel.'"

Then he goes on to explain that the case is different from that of a school attended by children who are engaged in learning merely the rudiments of knowledge, such as reading, writing and arithmetic, especially as they meet only for a few hours of the day at school, and for the rest of their time are under parental control. In their case he says, "the dangers of the mixed system may be comparatively remote." You will observe he does not say that even in such a case these dangers disappear. He says merely that they may in such cases be comparatively remote; "but," he goes on to say, speaking of colleges of higher education:

"There is danger of that suppression of truth, and of that concealment of religious profession and observance, which necessarily lead to religious indifference. *The danger is manifestly greatest for those who believe most.* If Anglicans were associated under such circumstances with Unitarians or Socinians, the necessity of avoiding topics of discussion would bring them down to the lower level. *The shortest rule of faith would become the common denominator.*"

The Archbishop goes on to speak of the system as "intrinsically" dangerous: "The danger exists altogether independently of any conscious effort at perversion. It is a danger inherent in the very nature of the 'mixed' system as worked out among youth in such a place of education. And this is what the Catholic Church means when she condemns that system as 'intrinsically' dangerous to faith and to fidelity in the fulfilment of Catholic duty." (p. 21.) Elsewhere Archbishop Walsh remarks that education under such auspices "takes the edge off a man's Catholicity." We heartily re-echo the expression; the Archbishop tells a great truth in those words.

These passages apply with equal, if not with greater force, to the state of education in this country; and this for various reasons. We have ostensibly no discrimination against Catholics. In reality there are and always have been, the atmosphere, the teachers and the books,—all Protestant or un-Catholic. We say teachers too, because until lately the proportion of Catholic teachers has been very small, and we greatly fear, except in rare cases, "the edge was taken off *their* Catholicity" before they were allowed to teach secular science; but nothing Catholic. In one of the schools of this diocese the Catholic teacher was told by the petty county supervisor she was not to mention the name of God in the school. In another school the Catholic teacher was told to take the crucifix out of the school-room. We suppose this is strictly in accordance with "non-sectarianism;" which makes it all the more objectionable to Catholics.

A further danger from this kind of teacher is that public school teachers are simply required to stand the examination, and prove their title to a good character. But this is not enough for one who is to take the place of a parent and watch over the children. Here is a vital point. The teacher will consider his work done when he has taught; but the recreation and the recess, and absence from the school-room, frequently unavoidable, give the children a freedom too often fatal. Then there is the further insuperable objection and fatal error of the education of children, in which the theory is, that the gentleness of the girl softens the ruggedness of the boy—but at the expense of both. Any expert physician can give you an interesting lecture on the physical effects of such a system. Besides the indisputable physical effects of acts against the moral code, there have been frequent exposures of moral disorders in these schools. Look at the recent Cleveland sensation in this respect; it is not the most recent known to us, however. It has been said that the standard of female virtue has been greatly lowered. We are afraid this is so, and it is not going to improve under the prevailing system of public education. We know perfectly well that experience shows absolute prevention of vice among children to be impossible; but it can and ought to be reduced to the least amount. The public school system, however, will not effect this. Add to this the perverted system of morality taught; perverted because divorced from religion, and falling back on æsthetic ideas. A teacher with whom we were conversing some time ago remarked: "This teaching children to avoid evil because not beautiful, but ugly, deformed; this making beauty a standard of good, has the effect on me of causing me to lose sight of distinctions between good and evil as taught by religion." It is a fact that a confessor has to fight against a tendency, in those who come in contact with the public school influence, to look on

certain sins against nature, Malthusian theories and secret indulgence, as no harm at all. A very brief experience in any large city will prove this. It is the reason why so many non-Catholics send their children to the schools taught by the religious orders and by Catholic lay teachers under the surveillance of the priest.

On the other hand we are fully convinced that many upright and earnest teachers are teaching in the public schools, and many pupils attending them are of exemplary life, and with the modesty they learned under the parents' roof. But everything is handicapped by the want of the restraining influence of religion, and secret immorality is on the increase.

To sum up then the grounds of our answer, we say that Catholics are right in their attitude on the school question; in asserting the necessity of denominational schools, and in claiming as due to Catholics, in justice, a corresponding portion of the school fund, or, what is equivalent to that, exemption from taxation for schools; because of the intrinsic defect of a system that excludes religion; because of the hurtful anti-religious and anti-Catholic influence at the helm, both in the normal school and in the institute; because of the influence of Freemasonry against religion, and of its scheme to possess itself of elementary education; because of the judgment of the Church,as expressed by able bishops, and by councils, declaring such a system intrinsically dangerous to faith and morals, which cannot be taught and maintained apart from religion; because even expert physicians tell us of the evils of the system of co-education of children of different sexes—apart from acts of immorality; because of the well-known frequency of scandals among the children; and lastly, because the moral ideas of Catholic children become perverted, so that they come to look on sins against nature as no harm.

These grounds are more than enough to justify and strengthen Catholics in standing firmly to their principles. We say this all the more emphatically because we are persuaded that our American people wish for the best; and did they believe what we have written above, would undoubtedly take the movement for denominational education under the patronage of their good will, and carry it through triumphantly; at least for all who want denominational education; and we venture to say that every American parent who knows the world, on opening his eyes to the real state of things, *would* want it. More than once we have been obliged reluctantly to decline to receive the children of non-Catholic parents in our Catholic schools for want of room or for other reasons that made the decisions imperative. For it has happened, not seldom, that as a last resort, a non-Catholic parent, in his desperation, has put his child, ruined by the freedom of the public school, in some Catholic institution or parochial school, placing his last hope in the influence of Catholic education.

Of a truth, that influence is wholesome. The child comes from home bright and cheerful, sure to meet a smiling, motherly face. A few moments of play under the watchful eye of the teacher, whose highest motive is to help save that soul and form a useful member of society and of God's household, here and hereafter. The bell summons to Mass; the day's work is begun by prayer, the greatest of all, the Holy Sacrifice, which appeals to the faith and love of the child. Prayer to the Holy Mother of God directs the thought to her who is the model of womanhood, the lily of God's garden. The school opens with the brief lesson in catechism, carefully explained and well illustrated, teaching duties to God, to the State, to one's fellow-men, respect for authority, obedience to law, charity to all, the excellence of virtue, and especially the duty of holy purity of life, which is sullied by one deliberate foul thought. The crucifix is on the wall, and the pierced hands and the bleeding body tell of the frightful expiation of the immorality of man by Him who said: "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God." The picture of Mary is prominent, and her mild, pure eyes beaming on her children make them love her beautiful life, and lure them on by the odor of her virtues, to run after her in the ways in which she walked. To please her and her Divine Son the Catholic child labors willingly, and tries to overcome himself in moments of weariness or distraction from his other studies, so that in this, as in other things, is it verified that "piety is useful." When faults are committed, Christian charity, quick to see, presides over the correction, using gentleness of manner, even when administering a well-merited chastisement; dwelling more on the offence to God than on the displeasure to the teacher or the harm to the pupil himself. Then come the rewards, administered with discrimination, directing the mind to one's spiritual well being. Then the joyous feasts that come in the year tell of the consoling truths of the faith, the life of which is the charity which makes one love God, and obey Him, by loving one's neighbor, his kindred, his fellow-men, the State, in whose patriotic, festive days all take part with a loyalty second to none.

Thus the foundation of a useful life is laid. Is it not a good one? Does it not give hope of a good and useful citizen? Does it not afford ground to believe that should any one, as will now and then happen, forget himself and fall away, he will remember his early training and more easily return? Only just now we come from receiving back a poor girl, whose conscience recalled to her the lessons she had learned from the Sisters, and the elevating influences she had once experienced. Such is the frequent happening in the life of every priest engaged in the active ministry. He knows and appreciates how salutary is the early Christian training. When it is wanting, how blank is everything; dreary, hopeless!

IN MEMORIAM.

THE RIGHT REV. JAMES O'CONNOR.

LESS than one year ago the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW was deprived, by death, of its editor-in-chief, Monsignor Corcoran, to whose distinguished ability and invaluable services to the REVIEW a fitting tribute was paid in the October number of last year. Now, we have to mourn the loss of the Right Rev. James O'Connor, D.D., late Bishop of Omaha, who, along with Monsignor Corcoran, most actively and efficiently aided the originators and proprietors of the REVIEW in founding it, determining its scope, and giving to it the high character and prestige which, from its very inception, it has possessed.

While Bishop (then Doctor) O'Connor remained in the vicinity of Philadelphia, he shared with Monsignor Corcoran the work of editing the REVIEW. After he was appointed Vicar Apostolic of Nebraska and the adjoining territories, and, in consequence thereof, removed to Omaha, distance prevented him from taking part in the practical editorial work, but his warm interest in the REVIEW continued unabated, as was shown by his correspondence with Monsignor Corcoran and the proprietors, by his writing several valuable articles on subjects of great importance, and also by his soliciting and obtaining from personal friends a number of very interesting and able papers.

Were it consistent with the scope of this notice to attempt to sketch the life and character of this exemplary priest and bishop, it would be a task we would most lovingly essay. For it is not too much to say of him, that in all the many and various positions he was called to occupy during the forty-five years that elapsed between his ordination and his death, he discharged their duties, difficult, delicate and onerous as they often were, with rare prudence and tact, with untiring diligence and energy, and with a devotedness which plainly showed that the feeling uppermost in his heart was that he must be ever doing his MASTER'S work. His performance, too, of that work in whatever position he occupied was signally blessed of God, resulting in abundant harvests of spiritual fruit to His greater glory.

Whether as a missionary in the wilds of western Pennsylvania, visiting scattered settlements of a few Catholics, or as pastor of an established parish, or discharging the duties of rector of a

theological seminary, or as vicar general, or administrator of a diocese, or bishop, he was ever zealous, unsparing of self, diligent, energetic, prudent.

Bishop James O'Connor was a man of great natural gifts and of exceptional attainments. His scholarship was solid, accurate, thorough. He was not only a sound theologian, and well acquainted with church history and the ancient languages, but understood and spoke the German, French and Italian. His English was admirable for its simplicity and purity. Yet so unaffectedly modest was he, so self-repressive and humble, that his scholarly attainments, like his labors,—which were always carried on quietly and without outward demonstration,—only showed themselves in the work he accomplished, and the abundant fruit which that work everywhere and always brought forth.

He was an admirable director of souls, and few there are who, under God, have been more successful in converting to the faith those who were in doubt, in guiding those who were searching for the truth, and in advising and counselling converts after their reception into the Church.

But it is as a bishop that the name and memory of the Right Rev. James O'Connor will be perpetuated. It was during the fourteen years between his consecration to the episcopal office and his death that the admirable qualities we have already mentioned—his unselfish zeal, his indomitable energy, his eminent ability and prudence—most conspicuously displayed themselves in the vast work he so quietly accomplished, and the wonderful success which attended that work. When he entered it, his Vicariate was a wilderness of almost illimitable extent; when he was removed from it by death it had become one of the most flourishing parts of the Church in our country. What at the outset of his episcopal work was a simple Vicariate, now comprises seven regularly organized dioceses, equipped with bishops, clergy, churches, convents, schools and colleges.

Here in the East we highly esteemed Bishop O'Connor, and will not soon forget him. But it is in the far West, with the people and priests he ruled, where noble monuments of his holy zeal and energy confront men on every side, destined to be sources of countless blessings now and for ages to come, that the name of the Right Rev. James O'Connor, Bishop of Omaha, will be most highly honored, and his labors be most gratefully remembered and most fully appreciated.

May he rest in peace.

Scientific Chronicle.

ELECTRO-MAGNETIC THEORY OF LIGHT.

Views of Electricity.—Part I.

We do not intend to advance any new theory on this subject. Our object is to recall some of the answers that have been given to the question, "What is electricity?"

In whatever direction we turn, we meet practical applications of this agent. It is a motive power on our street-cars, and in our machine-shops, the source of light in our dwellings and on our streets, the power by which we converse with or send messages to absent friends. In a word, it is the helpmate of every branch of industry, a necessity to the development of our present resources and to our future material advancement. Its ubiquity, and the startling phenomena in which it is clothed, arrest our attention, and we hear on all sides the question, "What is electricity?" A question the many may ask, and to which the few can reply—and these few but inadequately.

Some seem surprised that an agent with which we are so familiar, and which is so subservient to our wants, which we can measure, hold in bondage or direct whithersoever we choose, should be so coy and succeed in concealing its true nature despite our vigorous efforts to unmask it. Yet we must be content with theorizing as to its nature, accepting as the best explanation that hypothesis which agrees best with all known facts and disagrees with none. So, too, the theory which is in unison with known electrical phenomena answers best the question, "What is electricity?"

In the present state of science we have reached two grand generalizations—the conservation of matter and the conservation of energy. The principle of the conservation of matter states that the amount of matter in the universe is constant. Solids may be liquefied or transformed into gases; elements may combine to form compounds, and these latter may be resolved into their constituents; but, in all these changes, there is no loss of matter; the amount of matter undergoing the change is always equal to the amount resulting therefrom. The verification of this principle is one of the elementary experiments of chemistry, and the equations by which chemical reactions are expressed are based upon it.

Although the principle of the conservation of energy does not admit of a proof as rigid as that in support of the preceding principle, still there is the strongest indirect evidence in its favor. If true, it ought to give certain results under certain test conditions. This it does; and, as there is no valid objection to it, scientists accept it. According to this principle, when an amount of a certain kind of energy disappears, it is not destroyed, but changed into an exact equivalent of some other kind or kinds of energy. Hence, we have a mechanical equivalent of

heat, or the exact amount of mechanical energy capable of generating a given amount of heat, and *vice versa*.

Under which head, then, will we class electricity? Is it a certain kind of matter, or is it a certain form of energy? At different times, it has been regarded in both these lights. There have been fluid or material theories of electricity; and not many years ago there was a tendency to assign it a position as a form of energy. This was avoiding Scylla to rush into Charybdis. It was due principally to an analogy which seemed to exist between electricity and sound, heat, and light. This analogy has not been verified, and although, at the present, we cannot say exactly what electricity is, still, in the present condition of science, we are in a position to state what it is not.

The theory, then, in which the labors of all past and present scientists culminates, states that electricity is neither a form of energy nor a form of matter, but provisionally defines it as a property or condition of matter; not of ordinary matter, but of the all-pervading ether by which ordinary matter is everywhere surrounded. At first sight, it seems that the electricity of an electrified body is a condition of that body itself. When a piece of glass and a piece of resin are rubbed together, and then separated, it is found that they attract one another with a force which varies inversely as the square of the distance between them. But when these bodies were pulled asunder, work was done, according to this theory, not upon two isolated bodies mutually acting at a distance, but upon a system made up of the two bodies and the ether between them. This latter was stressed by their separation, and the tendency of the bodies to approach one another is not due to their mutual action, but to the elastic tendency of the ether to recover its original condition.

The formation of a theory is not the work of a day, nor the work of one man. It may imply the labors of centuries, the accumulated knowledge of a host of experimenters, the converging of scattered rays of truth, which dispel the darkness or pierce a rift in the mist, revealing to one of keener sight, or to the patient watcher on the towers of science, fields of thought before unsuspected, or truths but dimly discerned. Nature may sometimes deprive the scientist of the merit of discovery by throwing facts under his feet, but there yet remains an ample field for the exercise of his sagacity in the proper appreciation of the effects which are merely incidental to his researches. To seize these as they arise, to pursue them through their consequences, to distinguish them from related phenomena, to expand them by comparison and generalization into comprehensive natural laws, requires the highest power of philosophical inquiry.

In this work the scientist is aided by the labors of his predecessors in the same field. The facts they accumulated, the phenomena they described, and the observations they recorded, form a rich bequest to the better equipped and better disciplined observers of a later day. While, however, in all the other branches of physics we had the experience of ages to draw upon, still in electricity this rich heritage was wanting; for the great discoveries which have accumulated concerning this agent,

its subservience to man as a mechanical power, its application in every division of science and in every department of the arts, are peculiarly due to the labors of our own age.

Although Thales of Miletus, six centuries before the Christian era, was acquainted with the fact that amber could be electrified by friction; although Theophrastus, Pliny, and other writers, mention this same property of other substances; although electric lights shone forth from the javelin of the Roman soldier, and from the masts of the Roman squadron, presaging storm or calm, as Helen or Castor and Pollux, the names by which these displays were known, recalled the terrors of war or the joys of peace, still such phenomena were regarded with superstition, and provoked no scientific research.

So over twenty centuries rolled away, and man's knowledge of electricity remained the knowledge of a few isolated facts. The vein which cropped out to challenge the attention of the miner remained unexplored, and its treasures were reserved to reward the toil and crown the enterprise of our own generation.

The work of classification in electricity was first begun in 1600, by Dr. Gilbert of Colchester, physician to Queen Elizabeth. He published his results in the beginning of the 17th century, in a work entitled "De Magnete." In this work he enumerates all the substances then known to be susceptible of electrification, and mentions some of the circumstances which affect electrical phenomena, such as the hygrometric state of the atmosphere.

After a century of inactivity, two laborers appeared whose work in this field gave a new stimulus to research in electricity. They were Grey and Dufay. The former made the generalization of electrics and non-electrics, or bodies capable of electrification by friction and those which were then considered incapable of such electrification. In connection with Wheeler, he also established the distinction—conductors and insulators.

Dufay extended the catalogue of electrics, transmitted electricity through a cord 1300 feet long, and experimented on the disruptive discharge of an electrified body. He was the first to deduce general laws from his own experiments and those of other investigators, and to put in more definite form the principles of attraction and repulsion between electrified and neutral bodies. But his great contribution to science was his theory of the existence of two distinct kinds of electricity. "Chance," he says, "threw in my way another principle . . . . which cast a new light upon the subject of electricity. The principle is, that there are two distinct kinds of electricity, very different from one another; one of which I shall call vitreous and the other resinous electricity. The first is that of glass, rock crystal. . . . . The second is that of amber, copal. . . . . The characteristics of these two electricities are that they repel themselves and attract each other."

Long before this, the effects of electricity had been attributed to virtues, effluvia and atmospheres, of which no very distinct conception was formed. But this was the first attempt at a clear answer to the question,

what is electricity? Thus it was considered a material fluid, or rather two fluids endowed with the powers of attracting and repelling.

This theory does not seem to have been very widely adopted, and was lost sight of when Franklin proposed his one-fluid theory. According to Franklin, electricity is a single fluid contained in definite amount by every body in its neutral or unelectrified condition. This fluid possesses the power of attracting ordinary matter. When a body is in its neutral state, the quantity of electrical fluid in it is held in equilibrium by the attraction of the particles of the body, so that it cannot act on other bodies. But if a body by any means obtains more than its natural amount of this fluid, the surplus, which is not held bound by the matter of the body, attracts other bodies, and the body which has the surplus is said to be positively electrified. If a body has less, it is ready to take electricity from any neutral body that is near it, so that each will have less than their natural share, or will be negatively electrified. When two bodies are rubbed together, one parts with some of its electric fluid, so that after the rubbing one has an excess, or is charged positively; the other a deficit, or is charged negatively. The acceptance of this theory marked a new epoch in the history of electricity, remarkable for the accuracy of experimental detail, the generality of the laws unfolded, and the practical ends to which electrical knowledge was directed.

But the great principle of electrical induction had not yet forced itself upon observers. It was in 1753 that Canton presented to the Royal Society a series of experiments which brought out this fact. To the study of this single phenomenon is due the great progress made in electrical theory. Even the facts on which Dufay and Franklin based their theories, although not then recognized as such, were induction phenomena. When, however, Canton's report was made known to Franklin, he succeeded in explaining the phenomena, and showing that they were exactly what might be expected from his theory on the assumption that the fluid was self-repulsive but attracted ordinary matter. The satisfactory explanation then given by the one-fluid theory made it very popular.

Robert Symmer, however, doubting the sufficiency of Franklin's theory to explain fully all known facts, reconsidered Dufay's theory and published his views in 1759. While maintaining the dual nature of the electric fluid, he showed that the vitreous and resinous fluids were not independent of each other, as Dufay had supposed, but were co-existent in unelectrified bodies. In their neutral condition all bodies have equal amounts of these opposite fluids, and as the fluids mutually attract these equal quantities, hold each other bound, and thus prevent any electrical display. Electrification would therefore consist in increasing or diminishing the amount of either of these fluids in the body. As Symmer did not support his theory by any extensive application to the phenomena of electricity, it did not shake the confidence placed in Franklin's hypothesis until the mathematicians had thoroughly invaded the field and subjected this branch of physics to the rigorous canons of mathematical calculation.

The necessity for some quantitative measure of the forces of attraction and repulsion was long felt by experimenters, and the first real attempt in this direction seems to have been made by Æpinus. He took the hypothesis of a single fluid, but found that besides the force of attraction existing between the particles of the body and the electric, he had to admit a force of repulsion between the particles of the bodies if he would give mathematical expression to the phenomena of attraction and repulsion. Otherwise the mutual electric inertness of two bodies in the neutral state could not be explained. For since the fluid in the one attracts the matter of and repels the fluid in the other, there will be two attractions against one smaller force of repulsion. Hence another force of repulsion is required, that the neutral bodies may be in equilibrium. Again, in the case of two negatively electrified bodies, since negative electricity is a deficit of the fluid and the fluid is the repulsive element, two bodies thus electrified would not repel each other, except in the supposition that there was a repulsion between the particles of the two bodies.

Æpinus states that it horrified him to attribute to matter a force of repulsion besides the force of mutual attraction of universal gravitation. But he finally adopted the theory, and worked out the mathematical expressions for the laws of attraction and repulsion. The difficulty found by Æpinus has, however, been adroitly answered. The force of repulsion of matter is considered less than the attraction of matter for the electric fluid, so that there would be a resultant attraction which would explain gravitation as an electrical phenomenon.

Masotti, extending the calculations of Æpinus, found that admitting the suppositions of the one-fluid theory, the particles would exert a repulsive force at very small distances, which, on increasing the distance would first vanish and then change to a force of attraction, which at sensible distances would vary inversely as the square of the distance. Hence, the theory would offer an explanation of gravitation and of many other properties of matter.

But the two-fluid theory had also its mathematical advocates. In 1785 Coulomb began his investigations. By means of the torsion-balance, which he invented, he first showed experimentally the laws of electrical attraction and repulsion. This gave rise to the necessity of expressing by mathematical formulæ the intensity of the electric charge on different parts of variously shaped conductors placed within each other's influence. The one-fluid theory accounted for such phenomena in a general way, but none of its advocates brought forward exact mathematical expressions which could be compared with the experimental results obtained by Coulomb's instruments. The mathematicians, therefore, adopted the two-fluid theory as the basis of their calculations.

Coulomb's investigations are remarkable for the ingenuity with which he arrives at certain approximate conclusions without the aid of theoretical numerical results, which were wanting to him on account of the undeveloped state of mathematics. But not long after, owing to the great progress made in astronomy, mathematics was so advanced as to afford these numerical results; and in 1801 an exact solution of the

problem of the distribution of the electric fluid on a spheroid was given by Biot. The complete subjugation, however, of this portion of electrical science to mathematical analysis is due to Poisson.

In the work of Æpinus and Coulomb we find the application, in a particular case, of the general concept of attraction and repulsion introduced by Newton. Poisson perfected and extended the mathematical treatment of this concept in the case of electrical phenomena, and may be said to hold the same place, with reference to the founders of the fluid theories of electricity, which Laplace holds to Newton.

Poisson's calculations were based on the two-fluid theory as modified by Coulomb. He considered the attractions and repulsions, not as forces exercised by the bodies, but as altogether due to the fluids with which the bodies were charged. The particles of each of these fluids are assumed, by him, to repel each other, while they attract those of the opposite fluid. These conditions supply the mathematical formulæ necessary, and these formulæ are in harmony with the observed results.

The beautiful agreement of the calculations with experiments seems, at first sight to prove that the hypotheses on which they are built must represent the real state of things, and be the complete answer to the question, "What is Electricity?" But such evidence is not conclusive. Any true view of electricity must be consistent with all known electrical phenomena, and must explain the connection undoubtedly established between electricity and magnetism. All that the mathematicians and supporters of the fluid theory required was centres of force acting on each other at a distance. This meant an ultimate fact incapable of further analysis. Although the Newtonian doctrine led to this conclusion, electricians were not to accept it as a final answer. This would be to rest content with knowing the laws of nature without inquiring into the manner in which she executes them.

In 1820, Professor Oersted, of Copenhagen, announced his discovery of the deflection of a magnetized needle, placed near a conductor through which a current of electricity was flowing. This was the first experimental proof of a relation which was long thought to exist between electricity and magnetism. The discovery was immediately pursued with ardor by many investigators, among whom Ampère stands out conspicuously. The rapidity with which he prosecuted those beautiful researches which form the foundation of electro-dynamics, and announced their mathematical analysis, is truly wonderful, and shows clearly the advanced condition of physical science in 1820.

It was at this period Faraday began his researches. He was an indefatigable experimenter, who lived among phenomena from which he wrested their secrets in a way unintelligible to ordinary workers. Of one point he was thoroughly convinced, namely, of the impossibility of action at a distance. Hence, to him the work of the mathematicians, who based their calculations on the fluid theories and consequently on the action of forces at a distance, although it accorded with, still did not explain electrical phenomena. The medium surrounding an electrified body, or a wire carrying an electric current, possessed prop-

erties which had been ignored, and which must be accounted for if an adequate explanation of electric and electro-magnetic attractions and repulsions is to be given.

Hence, Faraday conceived electric induction to be the result of an action taking place between the electrified and neutral body through lines of contiguous particles in the mass of the intermediate body, which he called the dielectric. Faraday was convinced that the space or medium around an electrified or magnetized body had properties as essential as the magnet or electrified body itself, and that with the latter it formed a complete system. Thus Maxwell writes of him: "Faraday saw lines of force traversing all space where the mathematicians saw centres of force acting at a distance; Faraday saw a medium where they saw nothing but distance; Faraday sought the seat of the phenomena in real actions going on in the medium; they were satisfied that they had found it in a power of action at a distance impressed on the electric fluids."

At this time great progress had been made in the science by the German investigators, Gauss, Weber, Riemann and others, but all their mathematical investigations were based on action at a distance. The great success they attained in their mathematical treatment of electrical phenomena gave weight to their fundamental principle. Faraday, however, was not a mathematician, and hence was not able to give such expression to his facts and speculations as would permit of their comparison with those of the professed mathematicians.

This work was reserved for Maxwell, whose relation to Faraday is thus given by Doctor Lodge in his "Modern Views of Electricity": "Then comes Maxwell with his keen penetration and great grasp of thought, combined with mathematical subtlety and power of expression; he assimilates the facts, sympathizes with the philosophic but untutored modes of expression invented by Faraday, links the theories of Green, Stokes and Thomson to the facts of Faraday, and from the union there arises the young modern science of electricity, whose infancy at the present time is so vigorous and so promising that we are all looking forward to the near future in eager hope and expectation of some greater and still more magnificent generalization."

Thus by the labors of Faraday and Maxwell, supplemented and extended by Thomson and a host of eminent physicists of the present day, we have the "ether-stress theory" of electricity, which is more in accord with our present knowledge of electrical phenomena, and which does away with the necessity of admitting action at a distance, an admission adverse to both right reason and experience. This is the theory we alluded to in the beginning. It states that all bodies are immersed in a perfectly elastic and continuous medium called ether. This medium fills all space and penetrates into the interstices of ordinary matter. The evidence of its existence is based on the impossibility of transmitting energy through space without a medium, and as energy can be transmitted through space from which ordinary matter has been removed, modern physicists accept the existence of the ether as a necessity.

Our theory then states that electricity is a condition of this ether. When two electrified bodies approach each other, they do so, not because they have any new property, but because this continuous ether which surrounds them is under stress, and this stress gives rise to tensions and pressures in the ether, thus occasioning directions of pull and push along which these bodies must move. These directions are called lines of force. An idea of a line of force may be obtained from the familiar experiment of scattering iron filings on a piece of paper placed over a magnet. The iron filings arrange themselves in curved lines around the poles of the magnet: these are lines of induction or lines of force, or directions along which the stress in the ether causes the particles to move towards the magnet. So when we say a glass rod is electrified, we do not mean that the glass rod has any new property, but that the ether around the glass is now under stress, and a body, such as a pith ball, placed in this field of stress, will have to move in the direction of the lines of force. If we could place two balls in the interior of a mass of rubber, so that the rubber would cling to and penetrate them as the ether does ordinary matter, and then pull them asunder, the rubber would be stressed for some distance around the balls, and there would be directions in the rubber along which the balls would be urged. These directions represent lines of force.

This stress in the ether is not a piece of fiction. Faraday's experiment of the permanent deflection of a beam of polarized light in a magnetic field, shows that the ether carrying light waves was under stress. But how does this stress originate? I conceive that in the case of frictional electricity it may be at least partially explained in the following way: When two bodies are rubbed together they are heated. In this condition their particles are in a rapid state of vibration. This motion of the particles must disturb the continuous ether which surrounds and permeates the body. Whether such motion is capable of producing a static stress of the ether or not, the expansion of the body would, and this stress would be gradually removed as the bodies cooled. This agrees well with the fact that bodies charged by friction slowly lose their charge.

When a current of electricity runs along a wire, we are to look to the ether around the wire for the power which we have been accustomed to attribute to the wire itself, and see in that ether the alternate formation and releasing of stress along the conductor. Thus it is by the aid of the ether that we not only see but converse in the telephone, illuminate our streets and propel our cars. The ether is no longer an uncertain medium but a mighty power filling all space and binding the universe together, while by means of this theory we could reconstruct our theories of radiant energy, and could build up the wave theory of light had it remained unknown to the present day. But of this we will speak later.

Have we then the final answer to the question, what is electricity? This we cannot presume to say, but we feel certain that it is nearer the truth than any answer yet given. Still the theory may be but a temporary scaffolding, which will be removed when the edifice is complete.

THE ROTATION PERIOD OF MERCURY.

Johann Hieronymus Schröter of Lilienthal near Bremen, the Herschel of Germany, was the first to give any determination of the time it takes the planet Mercury to revolve on its axis. On March 26th, 1800, Schröter observed with his 13-ft. reflector that the southern horn of Mercury's crescent was blunted. To explain this phenomenon he assumed the interception of sunlight by a Mercurian mountain about eleven miles high. By carefully timing the recurrence of the phenomena, he concluded that the planet revolved on its axis in 24 hours 4 minutes. This conclusion was confirmed by observing the successive appearances of a dusky streak and a blotch observed on the planet in May and June, 1801. From a rediscussion of these observations, Bessel inferred that Mercury rotates in 24 hours 53 seconds on an axis inclined 70° to the plane of its orbit.

Ever since this has been regarded as the time of rotation of the planet, and in this, as is evident, it closely resembles the earth. There would thus be a close analogy between its seasons and ours. The effects, however, of the Mercurian seasons must be swallowed up in the more intense changes brought about by the great eccentricity of its path, which causes its distance from the sun to vary from 29 to 43 million miles. Moreover, the light and heat received by Mercury is from four to ten times the amount reaching our planet.

The rotation period of the planet must be fixed by the observation of spots on its surface. But as it is never found at any considerable angular distance from the sun, it must be observed in twilight or in the daytime. Observations made at the later time are very unsatisfactory. But M. Schiaparelli, at Milan, has been able to observe Mercury some 150 or 200 times between 1881 and 1886. The observations were made with an eight-inch telescope, but since that time he has confirmed his earlier conclusions by observations made with an eighteen-inch telescope.

On December 8th, 1889, the Academia dei Lincei, of Rome, held a special meeting, at which M. Schiaparelli related his discovery of the rotation period of Mercury.

The fundamental facts in the problem are, first, if the planet is observed on two consecutive days, the aspect of its spots is identical or almost so. The same is the case if the interval between successive observations is two, three or more days.

To explain these facts, three hypotheses may be advanced. First, the planet turns on its axis once in twenty-four hours; secondly, it makes two or more revolutions in that time, or thirdly, its motion of rotation is so slow that an interval of a few days permits of no appreciable alteration in the position of the markings on its surface.

Professor Schiaparelli deduced from his observations that the motion of the spots on the disk was too slow to permit of either of the first two hypotheses. He therefore concluded that the period of rotation was very long.

From observations in '82-3, confirmed in '86-7, he concluded that the motion of the planet around the sun closely resembled the motion of the moon about the earth; that is, Mercury always turns the same face to the sun. Owing, however, to the great difficulty of making observations, it was impossible to prove that Mercury, like our satellite, turned on its axis in exactly the same time it took to make one revolution in its orbit. Professor Schiaparelli, however, takes the sidereal period of Mercury, about 87 days, as the time of rotation. Moreover, according to observations, the axis of rotation is practically perpendicular to the plane of its orbit, and around this axis the rotation is uniform. The markings by which the rotation of the planet is noticed are very faint, and it is not an easy matter to offer any satisfactory explanation as to their nature. They may be peculiarities in the solid crust of the planet, or as Professor Schiaparelli thinks, be seas like ours. This latter is not unlikely, as Mercury is known to have a very dense atmosphere. The climate, if this rotation period be correct, varies between that due to the perpetual presence of the sun almost vertically above cetain regions and its perpetual absence from others, unless, perhaps, these extremes are tempered by a more vigorous atmospheric circulation.

LEXELL'S COMET.

No class of heavenly bodies is subject to so many adventures and vicissitudes as comets. At the extreme point of their oscillation through space they are acted upon by the sun and by Jupiter and Saturn. They approach so close to the paths of these planets as to permit these heavenly giants to act as secondary rulers of their destinies. It is, in all probability, by the influence of these planets that they were originally started in their present courses, and by their influence they will be eventually diverted from them. A curious instance of this capricious dealing on the part of Jupiter was afforded by the comet of 1770. Lexell, of St. Petersburg, found that this comet, which was visible to the naked eye, performed its circuit of the sun in 5½ years. It travelled this path twice and then disappeared. It had not been observed before. In explanation of this peculiar behavior, Lexell suggested that a very close approach to Jupiter, in 1767, had changed the orbit of the comet, and brought it within the field of terrestrial observation, while in 1779, after its second journey in its new path, it approached Jupiter so as to be diverted into an entirely new course. This explanation, suggested by Lexell, was confirmed by the analytical inquiries of Laplace and Leverrier. But it seems that after its long absence it has returned to us again. In 1770, at its nearest approach to the earth, it was less than one half a million miles distant. At that time, Laplace calculated that if the comet had any considerable mass it would have produced a very appreciable disturbance in the motion of our planet in its orbit. It was determined that if its mass was equal to that of the earth it would have

shortened our year by something like three hours. As there was no appreciable disturbance, Laplace concluded that its mass was very much less than the one three-thousandth part of the mass of the earth.

From the fact that this comet has not been seen since 1770, it has been known as the lost comet. But in July last Mr. Brooks reported the discovery of a comet which has since been under observation. Following on the discovery of the comet, is a discovery by Mr. S. C. Chandler, the well known mathematical astronomer. He has found that it revolves in an elliptical orbit about the sun in seven years; and through the discoveries at the Lick observatory we are informed that it is attended in its wanderings through space by companion comets. During the course of his investigations, Mr. Chandler found that Brooks's comet must have made a very close approach to Jupiter in 1886, and that the attraction of the planet then threw the comet into its present orbit. Then arose the suspicion that this comet might be identical with Lexell's comet. This surmise gave a new impetus to his investigations, and he determined that previous to its encounter the comet was moving in an orbit entirely different from its present one. Mr. Chandler says: "Several months before reaching its perihelion it passed, near the beginning of 1886, into the sphere of Jupiter's attraction, and was deflected into a hyperbolic path about the planet, remaining for more than eight months under its control—the disturbing action of the sun during most of the interval being insignificant. The eccentricity of the hyperbola was but slightly in excess of unity, so that the comet narrowly escaped being drawn into a closed orbit as a satellite of Jupiter."

Mr. Chandler moreover states, that on its close approach to Jupiter, it passed somewhat outside the orbit of the third satellite, and that, in all probability, the unequal attraction of the planet and its satellites brought about the disruption of the comet, yielding the present comet with its attendant companions. Although the comet is, at present, free from the preponderating influence of Jupiter, it is impossible to say what changes it has undergone since 1770, when it became the lost comet.

If Mr. Chandler's surmise is correct, and there seems to be good reasons for it, the comet would, in 1921, again encounter Jupiter, so as to be entirely changed in its course, being once more thrown into an orbit whose perihelion distance will be too great to permit of its being observed from the earth, when it will again regain its title of the lost comet. If this be verified, Mr. Chandler's discovery will stand as one of first importance in cometary history.

PROFITS OF THE PARIS EXPOSITION.

Now that we are busily engaged preparing for the great exhibition to commemorate the discovery of America, it will not be out of place to recall the commercial success of the late Paris Exposition. That such an exposition is of great financial importance is clearly proved by the

report which M. A. Neumarck made to the *Chambre Syndicate des Industries Diverses* of France. From this report we learn that the year of the exposition had increased the gold reserve in the Bank of France by $54,528,048. The other banks showed a gain of over $17,000,000.

During the exposition, one and a half million of foreigners visited France, and it is calculated that the American visitors, numbering 115,000, spent about $70,000,000 in gold. The receipts of the railroad companies were increased by over $13,500,000. The omnibus companies report an increase of $800,000. The cab company received an increase of revenue equal to $311,600. From May to October the tramways carried 6,342,670 people, receiving over $300,000.

The internal revenue felt the influx of visitors, and the hotels, restaurants, theatres, etc., had their receipts proportionately enlarged. The gross receipts, from May to November, of the Eiffel Tower, which cost $1,502,819, amounted to $1,291,916.80. The exposition proper had a profit of $1,600,000. Besides these receipts there were strictly private receipts which can only be approximately estimated. After a thorough discussion of the figures, the direct monetary gain is put down at about $350,000,000. This is convincing proof that a national exhibition is the source of not only future prosperity on account of the stimulus it gives to the different industries represented, and the information it gives respecting the resources of the nation, but is also the source of immediate gain. But to effect these ends, the exhibition must be carried out on a grand scale, such as we expect to see in the case of our own national exhibition.

SMOKELESS EXPLOSIVES.

If the invention of modern ammunition will entirely change the character of future warfare, there will undoubtedly be far greater changes produced by the invention and adoption of an efficient smokeless explosive. Until recently little thought seems to have been given to this subject, probably because in time of war the cloud of smoke arising at each discharge was not always inconvenient, but frequently so shrouded the soldiers as to permit of important manœuvres unsuspected by the enemy. The great disadvantage, however, of smoke in mines and in sport has directed attention to the production of a smokeless powder.

In 1846 all thought that gun cotton had solved the problem, for gun cotton, consisting of carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen and oxygen, being a hexnitrate of cellulose, is, on explosion, broken up into nitrogen, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, marsh gas, other hydrocarbons and water. The former are transparent gases, and the latter, at the moment of liberation, assumes the form of a highly heated vapor, hence there is nothing to obscure the view. In the case of gunpowder, on the contrary, we have a mixture of some nitrate as saltpetre, carbonized vegetable matter as charcoal, and a quantity of sulphur. When such a mix-

ture is exploded, a large proportion of the resulting products is not gaseous at the temperature reached, and this solid residue is driven out of the gun in the condition of a finely divided powder and suspended in the gases and vapors resulting from the explosion.

The introduction of smooth-bore guns, and the increase in their size and power, necessitated a change in gunpowder, which would modify the violence of its action so that these new pieces might be used with safety. The result was practically reached by varying the size and form of the small particles that make up a charge. According to the different variations in the size and shape of the powder-grain, we have rifle large grain, pebble, bowlder, pellet and prismatic powders. This latter was the suggestion of Doremus, an American. Thus the solution of the difficulty was sought rather in a modification of the mechanical character of the charge than in a change in the constitution of the powder. It is true that some result had been reached by varying the proportion of the ingredients, but the most important change occurred when two German chemists, Heidemann and Duttenhofer, turned their attention, not only to a variation in the proportion of the ingredients, but also to a modification in the character of the charcoal. They labored independently, but reached simultaneously the same result.

The powder produced by these two chemists was a brown prismatic powder, containing a higher percentage of saltpetre and lower percentage of sulphur than the ordinary black powder, while the charcoal ingredient was prepared by the action of superheated steam on wood or other vegetable matter, a process employed by Violetto in 1847. This powder, on account of its color, was called cocoa powder. In this powder the oxidizing agent, saltpetre, is found in greater proportion than in ordinary black powder, hence the sulphur and charcoal are more thoroughly oxidized, and there is less solid residue. The amount of gas and vapor produced by both powders is about the same for the same temperature, and although the amount of smoke is the same, still, in the case of the cocoa powder, it disappears sooner, because the charred wood contains more water and also more hydrogen, which is oxidized to steam, and this steam condenses and dissolves some of the salts of potassium formed, thus bringing about a more rapid dissipation of the smoke. Here, then, we have the first step, not only in decreasing the rate of discharge, but also in removing the great inconvenience arising from the dense smoke produced by an explosion of black powder.

In naval warfare it is absolutely necessary, in order to defend a man-of-war from the attack of a torpedo boat, to keep the latter in sight, that it may be effectively dealt with. This is impossible when the explosive employed yields a large amount of smoke, hence chemists have labored to produce a suitable explosive. Mr. Gaus, a German chemist, conceived the idea of employing ammonium nitrate as an ingredient of powder, since the products of its decomposition are all gaseous. His powder, which he called amide powder, was not, owing to the hygroscopic character of ammonium nitrate, free from the absorption of moisture, and moreover yielded on explosion a considerable quantity of smoke. Mr. Heidemann

has, however, been successful in modifying Gaus's method and producing an ammonium nitrate powder which is but very slightly hygroscopic, and which produces but a small amount of smoke that readily disappears. The charges are enclosed in sealed metal cases so as to preserve them from the moisture of the air. It gives remarkably good results, and must be considered as the first partially successful smokeless powder.

There have been numerous rumors of the invention of various kinds of smokeless powder which were perfect in action, but after thorough examination and experiment they were found wanting, and smokeless powder is still in the experimental stage. Gun cotton is by far the best smokeless explosive, but a great difficulty is to be overcome in controlling and regulating its rapid combustion. Partial success was achieved in this direction, both by Van Lenk in Austria, and Sir Frederick Abel in England. Van Lenk's method of controlling the rate of explosion consisted of converting threads of cotton into the most explosive form of gun cotton, and winding or plaiting these threads so as to regulate the air-space in the mass. Abel's method has been in use in England for over eighteen years, and consists in reducing gun-cotton fibre to a pulp, purifying it and converting it by pressure into a homogeneous mass of any form or size.

The smokeless powder adopted by the French government for the Lebel rifle no doubt contains picric acid as one of its ingredients, although its real composition is kept a secret. Want of stability has led to its abandonment for a more simple preparation. Work has been steadily pursued in Germany on this all-important point, and the results obtained have no doubt been greatly exaggerated.

Mr. Alfred Nobel, the inventor of dynamite, has produced a good smokeless powder by combining nitro-glycerine with one of the lower products of the nitration of cellulose. By combining a larger portion of nitro-cotton with the nitro-glycerine and using camphor to combine the two, as well as to deaden the violence and reduce the rate of explosion, Mr. Nobel has obtained a very good smokeless powder. Modifications of it are now undergoing severe tests.

The problem is a difficult one, and after the proper powder has been prepared it will have to stand the test of storing on land and sea, which may prove too severe for it. The problem, however, seems to be approaching solution. Absurd rumors of the powder being noiseless as well as smokeless have been circulated. In the tests that have been made in Germany and elsewhere with smokeless powder, the only difference in the report is that it seems to die out sooner than the report from a black powder discharge. The production of a perfect smokeless powder will undoubtedly produce a remarkable change in future warfare.

LIME SULPHITE FIBER.

In the manufacture of paper, wood cellulose, or sulphite fiber as it is called from the process by which it is manufactured, is destined to supersede rags. The industry is comparatively new in this country, but

will, it is confidently hoped, improve and expand rapidly under the direction of talented American engineers. The process of manufacture of this fiber is in operation in Detroit, Mich.; Appleton, Wis.; Lawrence, Mass.; Birmingham, Conn., and a few other places.

The wood, in the shape of chips or disks, is boiled in large digesters with a solution of bisulphite of calcium. The size of the digester and the pressure under which the wood is boiled, varies with the different methods employed. In some cases, large quantities are boiled under low pressure, as in the Mitscherlich process; in others, such as the Graham, Ritter-Kellner, Partington, and Schenk processes, smaller quantities are boiled under high pressure. Although larger quantities are cooked by the low-pressure method, still it requires a longer time, but, it is claimed that the output is of a better quality.

The digesters are iron or steel cylinders or spheres, built up of metal plates. This material is required to withstand the pressure. The interior of the vessel must be lined with some material capable of withstanding the corroding action of the acids.

It is in the construction of a suitable digester that great progress in this industry will depend. The iron digesters are generally lined with lead, which lining must be continuous to prevent the acid from reaching the metal covering. But lead has a higher co-efficient of expansion than iron, and as it must be attached to the shell in some way to prevent its collapse, it will either bulge out from the covering under heat, and return by contraction when cooled, or, if entirely soldered to the iron, be subjected to violent molecular strain, both of which will soon bring about fissures in the lining and necessitate repairs.

The Partington, Graham, and Ritter-Kellner, are lead-lined digesters. The Mitscherlich is brick-lined, and this clay-lining answers very well for low pressures. Its expansion is much less than that of iron, and hence the same difficulty is not experienced as with lead. The bricks are joined together with Portland cement, and a break in the lining is readily repaired. In the Schenk digester no lining is used, but the instrument is made of deoxidized bronze. This metal is regarded as sufficiently acid-proof to withstand the corroding effects of the contents. Owing, however, to unevenness in the quality of the alloy in different parts of the casting, it is soon honeycombed and rendered unsafe for use with the high pressures employed. Aluminium-bronze might possibly be prepared to make a valuable retort.

The bisulphite of calcium necessary for the cooking of the wood is prepared at the works. Sulphur is oxidized to sulphurous anhydride. Then this gas is forced, either by the vacuum process, or by pumps, or by natural atmospheric draught, into towers containing lime or limestone. The amount of sulphur consumed per ton of fiber varies from a minimum of 200 pounds in the Mitscherlich process to a maximum of 600 pounds in the other methods.

In the Mitscherlich process the wood is in the shape of disks, cut from the log, and about 1¼ inches thick. In the other methods chips are used. It is calculated that even if the finest saws are employed in

cutting the disks, still, about 10 per cent. of the wood is wasted in sawdust. Moreover, as the disks are arranged in the digester so as to obtain a maximum charge, much valuable time is consumed. But the claim which counterbalances this loss of material and time is that a much better output is the result.

The best output for the high-pressure process is about 1½ tons of fiber in 18 hours; in the low-pressure method, nearly 10 tons is the yield for 72 hours. As the pulp comes from the digester it is transparent, due to the bleaching action of the sulphurous acid. If the paper manufactured from this pulp is to do lasting service, a process of reoxydizing and bleaching with hypochloride of calcium must be gone through, otherwise the paper becomes yellow from exposure to light and air. This fiber fills a needed place in the manufacture of paper, and although it is an American invention, developed mainly in Germany, still we look forward to improvements in the present cumbersome methods when native talent has been directed to the importance of this industry.

Book Notices.

SUPERNATURAL REVELATION. An Essay Concerning the Basis of the Christian Faith. By *C. M. Mead, Ph.D., D.D.*, lately Professor in Andover University. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.

In our days, the apologist who undertakes to write a defence of the Christian religion has to cover a far wider field than was necessary half a century ago. Principles formerly admitted to be self-evident must now be re-established at the expense of much logical acumen. Facts, too, that have been accepted for centuries as historically certain are now called in question by the schools of modern criticism. Mr. Mead's book is well fitted to contest our enemies' position in both these directions.

The work before us especially deserves praise for the development of the indirect argument for the existence of God. Of the direct arguments, the teleological and moral ones are well stated. Not that the author regards them as the source of our belief in God. He represents them as conclusive only on the supposition of our existing theistic belief. All this is treated in so masterly a way by Mr. Mead that we must pardon his omission of what seems to us the strongest argument for God's existence.

In the chapter which treats of the origin of theistic belief, we notice a certain inaccuracy in the final appraisement of human knowledge. "Sure knowledge is the product of the combination and comparison of individual cognitions," is the last thesis of Mr. Mead on this subject. It may be all very true that our certainty of knowledge presupposes three data: the first condition, or the aptitude and truthfulness of our faculties; the first fact, or our own and the world's existence; and the first

principle, or that nothing can at the same time be and not be. But these data, the third of which has been left unnoticed by Mr. Mead, once presupposed in any given case, we require certainty of principles and of outward and inward facts without combining and comparing our perceptions with those of other men.

The question of a "primeval revelation" is admirably stated and solved. Though it bears only indirectly on the apologetics for Christianity, we owe thanks to the author for his thorough study of it. The chapters on the nature, the evidential value, and the existence of miracles, constitute the most important and satisfactory part of the whole book. We cannot understand, however, why belief in the existence of a miracle should necessarily presuppose belief in the moral uprightness of the thaumaturgus. That the high moral standing of a man *facilitates* our belief in him appears plain. But suppose a person should raise a dead man to life, feed thousands of men and women with a few loaves of bread, walk on the troubled waters of the sea, command the storm and calm waves, impart his miraculous power to others to such a degree that the laws of heaven and earth yield to the mere invocation of his name, it surpasses our comprehension why, in such a case, we should not be able to pronounce decidedly upon the reality of the miracles before being acquainted with the moral character of the wonder-worker. If such events can be the feats of jugglery, the most sanctimonious life can be hypocrisy; if the former are uncertain without the latter, much more may the latter be deceptive without the former.

For the rest of the chapters on miracles the general remark must suffice, that Mr. Mead excels here, too, in his *indirect* arguments. Without incurring the blame of minimizing, he divests the crude conceptions of miracles as opposed to us by our adversaries of their unscientific additions, so that the greater part of the anti-Christian argument is left without any foundation. The argument on "The Relation of Christianity to Judaism" is drawn from the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies in Christ. On the whole, it deserves great praise. The strength of the argument is rightly placed in the combination of the prophecies and their joint convergence towards Christ.

We are sorry to say that the excellence of the book is considerably marred by the defective reasoning found in the chapter on "the authority of the Scripture." The question at issue is stated plainly enough. "How does one come to know that the Bible is infallible? If we depend on its testimony for our Christian certitude, then we must be *sure* that its testimony is absolutely trustworthy. It is not infallible to *us*, unless we believe in the infallibility of the judgment which pronounces it to be infallible. How, then, is this judgment reached?" The *subjective* way of reaching it being rightly excluded, the author seems to know only one *objective* method of arriving at certitude, namely, the Apostolic origin of the New Testament. But this, too, he dismisses for the good reason that several New Testament authors were not Apostles, and that, besides, the general promise of inspiration does not necessarily imply inspiration in writing. Instead of answering the question the author tells us that Christianity is not the offspring of man's natural consciousness or of the Bible; that neither human opinion nor the Bible is invested with any authority over the Church; that Christ is the supreme and only authority. Afterwards he again states that the Bible is *mediately* authoritative, as if any Christian had ever denied that Christ's authority is supreme, or that the Bible must not be reverenced for its own sake.

But Mr. Mead does not seem to perceive that it is precisely the judg-

ment concerning the Bible's *mediate* authority which we must reach, before we can do as much as make an act of faith. Before we can believe God, we must first know that He has spoken ; and we do not know that God has spoken to us through the Bible or through Christian tradition —which also Mr. Mead acknowledges as authoritative—unless we have the full assurance of the *mediate* authority of either. A Catholic reaches this assurance through the living, divinely instituted and infallible authority of his Church. Mr. Mead professes to possess the same assurance because "Christians have direct access and relation to their divine Master." The position of the "papists," therefore, making the Pope Christ's infallible representative, does not appear to be so very unreasonable after all.

The last chapters on "the conditions and limits of Biblical criticism, and the appendix containing eight excursus on subjects whose special treatment would appear out of place in the book itself, contain much valuable information and are of a very conservative character. We must again point to the double excellence of the book, containing as it does the apology of the Christian revelation both against infidel philosophy and infidel criticism. Its general tone of moderation must secure esteem even in the camp of its enemies. Its typographical perfection and handsome binding will predispose the reader in its favor.

The Way, the Nature and Means of Revelation. By *J. F. Weir, M.A., N.A.*, Dean of the Department of Fine Arts in Yale University. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Bros.

This book takes us back into the atmosphere of the early Christian heresies, when theological terms were not yet settled, and pagan philosophy intermingled with Christian principles of faith and morality. Without adhering to the tenets of any particular creed, Mr. Weir employs the usual terminology of theological writers, but changes the received meaning of nearly every term. We shall, therefore, give an outline of the theological system of the author in his own words, leaving minor details unnoticed.

1. "The Free Spirit is the Father. The Spirit individualized in a divine soul is the Son ; and that divine soul is the Holy Ghost." Mr. Weir maintains that we would not be able to come to the knowledge of a personal God if He had not revealed Himself as such."

2. "The New Testament includes three distinct orders of divine manifestations—by the Son of man, by the risen Jesus, and by the Holy Ghost."

3. "The *Word* bears that relation to the Godhead that the soul in man bears to the indwelling spirit, when imparted from above."

4. "The incarnation of the Word was not the abrupt entrance of the Messiah into earthly existence, but the culmination in Jesus of long ages of travail in a psychical state. The process of incarnation was gradual and only consummated in the fulness of time, as witnessed by the prophets and in the Psalms. The *Word* incarnated in Jesus is God manifest in the flesh. Jesus manifested the Word, which in turn revealed the spirit."

5. "Previous to His baptism of the Holy Spirit, symbolized outwardly by its descent in the form of a dove, Jesus was a sinless moral man, in whom the Word, or Logos, was incarnated as a divine soul. . . . After the Holy Spirit had descended upon Him at His baptism, a change was wrought in the life of Jesus; thenceforth a new power was mani-

fested as abiding in the Son of man, a transforming spirit, transcending the righteousness of even a blameless moral life."

6. It must have been through gradual enlightenment that Jesus recognized in himself the Messiah. But when the presentiments respecting his divine mission had resolved themselves definitely Jesus then emerged from seclusion, and John's testimony, no doubt, gave to them the character and consistency of a settled conviction."

7. "It is plainly apparent that the Messiah came, not to establish religious forms, but to reveal in himself their fulfilment in an awakened *spiritual consciousness*."

8. "There was a reconciliation of the natural and spiritual states of consciousness in Jesus, who abolished in his flesh the enmity between the natural and spiritual orders of mind in man, making in himself of the twain one new man, so making peace. This is the great outcome of the incarnation."

9. "The manifestations of the Son of God in the son of man, as the Christ, is typical of the spirit individualized and domiciled in the soul of man, and this individualized spirit in man is of one substance with the Father. . . . . Jesus thus reveals in himself the ultimate destiny of the soul of man, whose inheritance is God."

10. "In order that we may understand the nature of the revelation made by the *risen* Jesus, it is essential that it be known that the natural creation includes as it were two worlds, a visible and an invisible sphere, a *physical* and a *psychical* realm. Divested of its garment of flesh the soul rises in a psychical realm."

11. "During the forty days intervening between his resurrection and ascension Jesus was in a preternatural or intermediate state of being, a *psychical* world, or hades, the abode of the departed."

12. "The *natural* and *spiritual* personalities in the creature are designated *man* and *angel;* in the natural world the soul is manifested as man, and in the spiritual world it is manifested as an angel or spirit. The natural man is outwardly organized in physical conditions, but the spiritual man is outwardly organized in psychical conditions; and these physical and psychical conditions pertain to the visible and invisible realms of *nature*."

13. "The nature of the Holy Ghost is outwardly psychical and inwardly spiritual; God manifest in the sanctified soul of the Son of Man; the spirit individualized or made personal in the soul of the ascended Jesus."

Enough has been given of Mr. Weir's notions to justify the opinion that, except as a religious curiosity and a specimen of the vagaries into which the Protestant principle of private judgment often leads those who follow it, his book is not worth reading. Apart from his erroneous views concerning the Holy Trinity, the incarnation, the person of Christ, etc., etc., Mr. Weir is widely astray, even on those subjects where one would naturally expect him to be reliable, viz., the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures and kindred topics.

It seems to be a hard truth for many persons to master, that the truths of the religious and supernatural order are just as actual and real as are those of the natural order. They exclude the visionary theories of the would-be, rationalistic theologian just as firmly as the formulas of mathematics resist the speculations of shallow scientists.

It is unpleasant to be compelled to say this, because Mr. Weir seems to be, personally, very much in earnest as to his religious life, and gives many beautiful applications of Old Testament prophecies.

JOSEPHI FESSLER, QUONDAM EPISCOPI S. HIPPOLYTI INSTITUTIONES PATROLOGIAE Quas denuo Recensuit Auxit. Edidit *Bernardus Jungmann.* Eccles. Cathedr. Brugens. Canon. Professor in Universitate Cath. Lovaniensi. Tomus I. Oeniponte 1890. Sumptibus et typis Feliciani Rauch Ratisbonae, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnatii. Apud Fr. Pustet.

Who that has seen the Migne Collection of the Fathers of the Church, the two hundred and twenty volumes of the Latin series and the one hundred and sixty-two of the Greek series, must not have thought within himself, how utterly impossible it would be for the most diligent student to acquire even a superficial knowledge of their contents. And yet, where else is the true student of sacred science to look for all the information he needs in the course of his studies? The Fathers are the witnesses of the deposit of faith; they are the best interpreters of the true meaning of the word of God; they are the Church's champions against all the attacks of heresy. How necessary, then, is it for the priest and for every student of theology and Sacred Scripture to have at command a hand-book which will serve as a guide to this immense treasure-house of learning, and show him at the same time how to make use of it profitably. Such is the object of the comparatively new branch of sacred science, which has been called patrology or patristic science.

All students, therefore, will be delighted that this new edition of the "Institutiones Patrologiæ" is now being published, the first volume of which we have received from Fr. Pustet of New York. The first edition came out in 1850. It was the work of Dr. Fessler, then professor in the Seminary of Brixen in the Tyrol, afterwards the renowned Bishop of St. Pölten or St. Hippolytus, and who will be always remembered as the Secretary-General of the Vatican Council. It might be called the first attempt to present a complete text-book of patrology, embracing not only the science in general but going over the series of the Fathers in particular, down to St. Gregory the Great (604).

This new edition of Dr. Fessler's work has been revised, augmented and edited by Dr. Jungmann, Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Patrology in the Catholic University of Louvain. Dr. Jungmann's name as the author of so many works on theology and Church history is a sufficient guarantee that the new edition has had the benefit of every new light that has been thrown on the works of the Fathers during the last forty years. Dr. Jungmann tells us in his preface that he undertook the work for the benefit of his students in the University of Louvain, who, having finished their ordinary seminary course, were led to perfect it by the deeper knowledge to be gained in the university. His additions are, specially, his comments on the Apostolic Fathers and the works of Dionysius, the Areopagite. In the first part of the work he has added a chapter on the influence of the Greek and Latin classics on the writings of the Fathers. He has omitted some paragraphs on the authority and use to be made of the writings of the Fathers, and has given shorter sketches of the lives and works of many of them, in order to keep the edition within the limits of two reasonable volumes. Patrology is that branch of sacred science which teaches us how to make proper use of the Holy Fathers in theology. The study divides itself naturally into universal and particular. In the prologue the author tells us what patrology is, its office, its necessity and utility, and then gives a brief history of it as a branch of theology. The *pars generalis* is divided into four chapters. (*a*) On the idea and authority of the Holy Fathers; (*b*) Criticism as applied to their writings; (*c*) Aids to the proper understanding of the Fathers; (*d*) The use to be made of their writings in general and especially in dogmatic and moral theology, as also for the study of the Sacred Scriptures and for preaching.

The *pars specialis* of this first volume, which ends with St. Ambrose, contains also four chapters. The first embraces all the Apostolic Fathers. The second takes in the Fathers of the second century. The third, the Fathers of the third century. The fourth is divided into three sections, bringing before us the Fathers who explained and defended the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Each chapter opens with an idea of the century, its general characteristics and the character of the writings of the epoch. From this analysis of the first volume the reader can judge how necessary the work is to every student of theology and to every priest who is desirous of keeping up his studies, or who wishes to be able to make use of the Fathers intelligently and easily in the preparation of his sermons and discourses. The only works heretofore published on the subject were Permaneder-Bibliotheca Patristica, 1841–44, Alzog's Grundriss der Patrologie, 1866, Schmid's Grundlinien der Patrologie, 1879; translated into French by Cornet, 1881, and last, and especially to be praised, Dr. Nirschel's Handbuch der Patrologie und Patristik. Three volumes, Mainz, 1881–85.

This edition of Dr. Fessler's Institutiones Patrologiæ ought to find a place at least in every priest's library. With it he will need no other book of reference in that branch of sacred science.

A Manual of Catholic Theology Based on Scheeben's "Dogmatik." By *Joseph Wilhelm, D.D., Ph.D., and Thomas B. Scannell, B.D.*, with a preface by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Vol. I. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1890.

Whilst reading this admirable book we were reminded forcibly of the remarks made by one of our most prominent prelates about the text-books used in our seminaries. He upheld the necessity of a thorough knowledge of Latin; that the preparatory course should so equip the students that they would be able not only to understand fully, but also to write the Latin language correctly, and that moral theology should be taught also in that tongue; but he held that for the other branches of sacred science it would be far better to have the text-books in English and the lectures of the professor also in that language. One thing we think certain, and that is that the clergy, as a rule, will not take up a work written in Latin unless they are forced to. They prefer to have their reading in the mother tongue. German and French ecclesiastical authors have long since acknowledged this truth. Most of the works of Bossuet are written in French, and his theological writings are voluminous. Gousset wrote both his dogmatic and moral theology in that language. Most of the theological works of German professors written for the clergy, and for the educated Catholic laity, their works on sacred Scripture, ecclesiastical history, and other branches are published in their native tongue. For some years past a corps of German professors have been publishing a full course of works pertaining to the sacred sciences. Prof. Scheeben is the author of the "Dogmatic Theology," the substance of the first volume of which is now given to us in an English dress by Joseph Wilhelm, D.D., and Thomas B. Scannell, B.D. It is, as its title implies, "A Manual of Catholic Theology," a manual giving the various arguments for all the truths of our holy faith, but giving them as briefly as possible. The work is very suggestive and very complete. The decrees of the Vatican Council receive due consideration. In a word, it is an admirable work, and one that we are sure will be hailed by the clergy with heartfelt thanks as the pioneer, we hope, to the publication of the whole series. It is one

of those solid works we stand so much in need of, and which so rarely appears. His Eminence, Cardinal Manning, has enriched it by an admirable preface. This first volume is the most important of the series. In the learned introduction, the author gives us the definition and division of theology; a short sketch of its history (short but good); and the special sphere of theology in our day. The work is then divided into three books. The first treats of the sources of theological knowledge, *viz.*, Divine revelation, the transmission of revelation, the Apostolic deposit of revelation, ecclesiastical tradition, the rule of faith, faith and understanding. The second book is on God; our Knowledge of God, natural and supernatural; God's Essence and attributes in general; His attributes in particular both negative and positive, internal and external; the Divine Life; the Divine Trinity; the Trinity in Scripture; the Trinity in Tradition; the Evolution of the Trinity from the Fecundity of the Divine Life. The third book is on Creation and the Supernatural Order; the Universe created by God, created for God; the Angels; the Material Universe; Man; the Supernatural Order; Grace; Theory of the absolutely Supernatural; theory of the relatively Supernatural; Concrete realization of the Supernatural order. We have given the headings of the various divisions to show how intensely interesting the work must be, and how every question treated is one that meets the burning difficulties of the age. St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, who died April 21, 1109, and is called the Father of Scholastic Theology, in his wonderful little work "Cur Deus Homo?" which is written in the form of a dialogue, introduces Boso as asking the question: "By what necessity and in what way did God who is omnipotent, take upon Himself the humility and weakness of human nature for its restoration?" and Boso gives this reason for his asking the question: "As right order requires that we should first believe the deep things of the Christian faith before we presume to discuss them by reason, so it seems to me to be negligence if, after we are confirmed in the faith, we do not study to understand what we believe." St. Anselm's work strives to make Boso understand why God became man, and this work of Prof. Scheeben is, as Cardinal Manning says, "A profuse exposition of the deep things of faith in the light of intelligence guided by the illumination of the Church." It would be difficult to say which parts of the work are the most important, when all treat of such living questions, yet we venture to say that the first and second books will be the ones that will be studied more deeply as giving answers to the infidel spirit of the times. We commend the book warmly to all our readers. We must not withhold a word of praise to the publishers. The work is gotten up in exceptional style, fine paper, magnificent print, tasteful binding, as was becoming such an important publication.

A Short Cut to the True Church; or the Fact and the Word. *Rev. Father Edmund Hill, C.P.* Notre Dame, Indiana: Office of the Ave Maria.

The author tells us in his preface that his little work was suggested by a passage in the "Invitation Needed" of the Rev. James Kent Stone, now Father Fidelis, C.P. The substance of the book was originally a lecture he gave at the close of a mission in Bishop Ryan's church in St. Louis, by whom he was encouraged to enlarge it to its present form. He invites his reader to look at certain *facts* from the standpoint of common sense; then to compare these facts with certain *words* of Scripture, and in making this comparison to use *their own* private judgment. This is his "Short Cut to the Church." In the second part he

"*tunnels*" through four great mountains or difficulties, that ordinarily obstruct the way of those looking for the true Church, viz., the Primacy of the Pope, Transubstantiation, Confession and Devotion to the Blessed Virgin. He treats these four great truths in the same way, first stating the *fact* clearly, then the *words* of Scripture, and shows that the *fact* never could have existed except in and through the words. We have read many works on these same topics, but we say candidly that for the vast majority of readers we have found none so striking and so suggestive or better fitted than this little volume. It is an excellent book to loan to one who is searching for the truth. It *must* set him thinking and will lead him to ask for fuller instruction. Father Hill is a convert to our holy faith, and we think has given us here the way the Holy Spirit led him into the Church. To give an idea of his style, we take this extract from the chapter on Transubstantiation:

"'But transubstantiation is so *very* hard to believe' you say. 'It positively contradicts the evidence of the senses.' (*a*) It ought not to present so much difficulty to the faith which believes in *transnaturation* recorded in both Testaments. For of course you admit that Moses, at God's command, changed water into blood (Exod. vii.)—and not merely in appearance; for the fish in the river died and the Egyptians could not drink. While, again, our Lord's first miracle, when at the marriage feast 'The conscious water saw its God and blush'd,' was a striking type of the Eucharistic change of wine itself into blood—so, at least, we Catholics say. Now, if you really believe (as I presume you do) in the *transnaturation* effected in these miracles, why is it so much more difficult to accept *transubstantiation?* In the former case a complete change is wrought both of substance, accidents and natural properties; in the latter, substance alone is changed, the accidents and natural properties remaining as before. Will you say that a complete change of *nature* is possible to divine power, but *not* a change of *substance only*, where the new substance assumes the accidents and natural properties of the substance it replaces? Reason itself forbids you to say so. . . . Then, as to the alleged contradiction to the senses, the very reverse is the truth. For, what do our senses come in contact with? Only with the outward forms, or 'accidents' of things. We can no more see a *substance*, philosophically speaking, than we can see a spirit. . . . Burn a piece of wood, for instance; a change of accidents or appearances, takes place, but is the substance destroyed? No, says philosophy; no, says science. Both authorities maintain substance to be indestructible—except, of course, to the creative power, which having produced it from nothingness, can cause it to return to its original. So, then in case of transubstantiation our senses rest on the *un*changed accidents or appearances of the consecrated bread and wine, and not upon the substance behind them. . . . They therefore tell us correctly as to what they come in contact with."

We consider this "Short Cut" a valuable addition to Father di Bruno's "Catholic Belief," Father Russo's "True Religion" and Cardinal Gibbon's "Faith of Our Fathers," and for a first book to be given to inquirers would prefer it to any of them.

REVELATIONS OF THE SACRED HEART TO BLESSED MARGARET MARY AND THE HISTORY OF HER LIFE. From the French of *Monsigneur Bougard*, Bishop of Raval. By a Visitandini of Baltimore. Translator of "The Way of Interior Peace." New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Bros. Printers to the Holy Apostolic See.

Alike to author and translator is this work most creditable. To both we are deeply indebted. In it they have given us, not merely a life of

Blessed Margaret Mary, not merely a history of the Sacred Heart's revelations to that great servant, but a splendid treatise on the devotion which has become so popular and beloved. On devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus we have read many books, but none with half the satisfaction, with half the love and fervor of soul with which we devoured the pages of the work before us. Cold indeed must be the heart it will fail to impress. From beginning to end it has not one dry page. Indeed there is a charm about it that holds the reader spell-bound.

Beginning with a picture most faithful and complete as the limits of the work permit, of the Church in France at the birth of Blessed Margaret Mary, the author from the very outset commands our closest attention. He leads us to the home of Margaret Mary; we see her as a little child; and what a beautiful, unearthly childhood was here; yet she had even at that early day her trials. Predestined undoubtedly of God for great things, she had nevertheless as she grew older to do battle against the wordly ambitions of her young heart. The grace of God triumphed however. She resolved to be a Religious. It is a beautiful picture the author gives us of the house, the convent of Paray, and the Order; the Visitation, in which Margaret Mary, directed by the Holy Ghost, had chosen to spend her life and consecrate it to God. Little did the daughters of St. Francis de Sales and St. Chantal realize the rare preciousness and beauty of the soul they were receiving in the person of the young novice, or the lustre she was destined one day to shed upon their community. Through the days and trials of her novitiate the author leads us with ever-growing interest. Often and often was she misunderstood, the very heights of her sanctity seemingly her cross. Then follows her profession, her solemn consecration to the Spouse she loved, as to few it has ever been given to love. And with her profession we turn to the grandest, sublimest side of her ever beautiful life. But we must not anticipate. Love with her was a passion. She loved God with all the intensity of her soul, with all the strength of her mind, with all the affection of her heart. And in return for that love God gave her the sweetest rewards, communicating with her, speaking with her in the most familiar ways—in fact choosing her to be the apostle of devotion to His Sacred Heart. For the story of these wondrous manifestations of divine love and the Sacred Heart's revelations to Margaret Mary we refer our readers to the work before us. There too they will learn the story of her sorrows, of the trials to which she was subjected because of her love of God. Following the touching beautiful story of Margaret Mary's life to the end, the author devotes the remaining chapters of his book to a history of the growth of the devotion to which she had consecrated every throb of her heart and every breath of her life. In the beginning it met with many obstacles; well intentioned and holy souls, not understanding, opposed it. But in the end it triumphed. To-day it is everywhere, for wherever there is a Catholic people and a Catholic altar there is love of the Sacred Heart. Here in our own country it is fast becoming the devotion par excellence. Let us pray that the love of God's Sacred Heart may continue to abound more and more with men, and that the story of Margaret Mary's devotion may lead them to a closer union with it.

NATURAL RELIGION. From the "Apologie des Christentums," of Franz Hettinger, D.D., Professor of Theologie at the University of Wurzburg. Edited, with an introduction on Certainty, by *Henry Sebastian Bowden*, of the Oratory. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. 1890.

More than once in the past Father Bowden has, by his writings, laid

the English-speaking world under no light obligations; but we doubt if he has ever before done us such signal favor as in editing and giving to the English-reading world this admirable work of Dr. Hettinger. His own introductory chapter on Certainty is most apposite and in keeping both in point of style and clearness and strength of reasoning, with the exceptionally able work which it prefaces. The book supplies a keenly felt want. That materialism and agnosticism are gaining ground, it were sheerest folly to deny. A few years ago, and here in this country, one heard but little of them. They had, of course, their disciples and devotees, but, conscious that the intelligent sentiment of the land was strongly against them, they maintained a respectful reticence. To-day the picture is changed They are no longer a few isolated men, without a habitation and a name, but a powerful and restless multitude, boastful, aggressive, defiant. We cannot afford to ignore them. If we would do honor to truth and preserve it, and make it powerful with men, we must meet these adversaries and vanquish them. We must meet them on their own ground and fight them with their own weapons. What is their ground? Reason, they tell us. What are their weapons? Again they answer, reason. From reason, then, and with reason we must fight them. How little able they are to stand the clear, penetrating glance of reason, there is no thinking mind that does not see. They reason, but unreasonably; starting from premises false in reason and philosophy, they build up a system, to the unphilosophic mind fair and plausible, but which in reality, because of its false foundation, has no existence.

Take the Agnostic. What is the grand keystone of his mighty arch, built so firmly, we are told, on the solid basis of reason, and which has lured so many unphilosophic minds from God and faith? "That doubt is prior to certainty, and that everything is to be assumed as doubtful till it is logically proved." Yet never was a falser principle expressed in words, or conceived in the mind; indeed, it is self-contradictory. What, on that hypothesis, would become of the great first principles which underlie all evidence and truth? Yet, on that basis of doubt as the primary condition of the human mind, agnosticism is founded; and from that false foundation it has risen to its present proportion. In the work before us, that false principle is combated and disproved with a force and clearness of reasoning that must carry conviction to every intelligent and honest mind. So, also, does the author, with a strength of logic and clearness of reasoning that are irresistible, take the ground from beneath the feet of the materialist, postulating, as does the materialist, that perception is the one test of truth, and the investigations of the microscope and physical measure and weight are the only media of true knowledge and exact definition." Did space permit, we would gladly follow the author in his splendid reasoning on the existence of God, on the possession by man of a soul, on man's relation to God and the end for which God created him and placed him here on earth. It were better, however, that our readers should do that work for themselves. It will repay them, and so clear and forcible is the reasoning, and plain and simple the language of the author, that few will experience difficulty in following him. We trust the work will meet with every encouragement, first for its own sake; secondly, for the good it will do, and thirdly, as an encouragement to its able editor.

PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS LIFE. By the *Very Rev. Francis Cuthbert Doyle, O.S.B.*, author of Lectures for Boys, Life of Gregory Lopaz, The Hermit, The Teaching of St. Benedict, etc. Second edition. London: R. Washbourne, Paternoster Row. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago, 1890: Benziger Bros.

This work, the author in his preface tells us, was written "for those

who desire to lead a solidly devout life, in the ecclesiastical, in the religious or in the secular light." It is eminently qualified, in our judgment, to bring about all the author claims. We admire the work, in the first place, for the singular clearness and directness of its method. Generally, our books on the spiritual life, in other respects most admirable, are lacking in method and plan, and in consequence fail of much good they are otherwise splendidly calculated to effect. In the opening chapter of his work the author treats of the end of man. For the sake of clearness, he speaks of it from a two-fold aspect. He considers first the ultimate end of man, of what should be the great goal of every mortal, viz., the possession of God. Then he takes up what he calls the subordinate end of man, essential to the attainment of the grand ultimate purpose of life, as is the eye to man, that he may gaze upon the sunlight. This subordinate end lies, he contends, in the three great virtues—charity, humility and purity of heart. Perfect in those virtues, he holds, and we think with every reason, that we fulfil the end of life and are assured of the possession of God. Setting before us these three fundamental virtues as the goal for which we must labor, the author proceeds to a consideration of the instruments by which and through which alone we can attain to these virtues. Under the term instrument, he classes (1) Prayer; (2) Divine grace; (3) Attention to the working of the Holy Ghost; (4) Imitation of Christ; (5) Renunciation; (6) Obedience. Each of these classifications he then treats separately. First, as they are in themselves in their own individual natures, and then in regard to their relations to the three great fundamental virtues, charity, humility and purity of heart.

Much that the author says in his treatment of these instruments of perfection, especially when speaking of prayer and grace, would seem, as men now live and think, to have reference chiefly to Religious, to those choice souls who have gone out from the great crowd of men and given themselves wholly to God, and yet it should not be thus. Living in the world and busy with many things, men should, nevertheless, be all for God. That they can be this, sanctifying their worldly pursuits and making them subservient to the interests of God, must be clear to every intelligent mind. Men do not love God and consequently do not serve Him, chiefly because they do not know Him; because, too, they do not understand the nature and the workings of the instruments with which they are to gain heaven. If men had clearer understanding of prayer and truer and more intelligent knowledge of grace and its marvellous capabilities they would, we feel assured, be better Christians. Therefore, to them as well as to the clergy and religious, we take especial pleasure in recommending "Principles of Religious Life." We regret not a little that the Reverend author did not give larger space and greater prominence to the question of the Sacraments, particularly to Confession and the Eucharist, for certainly they bear a wonderful part in the great scheme of salvation. We wish for the work a high measure of success. It is certainly worthy of it. Well conceived, splendidly developed, written in excellent style, and treating of a matter very dear, we would fondly believe to the hearts of men, it has everything in its favor.

THE POPE AND THE NEW ERA. Being Letters from the Vatican in 1889. By *William T. Stead.* Copell & Company: London, Paris, New York and Melbourne. 1890.

The letters which this book contains have been already published in a number of newspapers in England, the United States, and Australia.

Their style is clear and animated, and, no doubt, they will be extensively read.

In his introductory letter the author tells us that he honestly endeavored to overcome "the prejudices of a lifetime, and to examine facts in a spirit of that charity which hopeth all things and of a faith which revolts against the notion that a Church which to two hundred millions of our fellow-creatures is the sole fount of Christian teaching has been utterly disinherited of God." That the writer has not succeeded in his very laudable undertaking is proved by his subsequent declaration that "not even the constant and helpful presence of friends whom he loved and respected could overcome the keen antipathies naturally excited by the political heresies and theological superstitions that seem to be rampant in Rome.

Mr. Stead unequivocally acknowledges the services of the Church to society in past times, and also that she is now "doing a good and useful work among races of inferior civilization." By way of offset to all this he says: "We find a very different state of things when we turn from the civilizing activity of the apostles of the Propaganda among races of heathen creed and inferior civilization to the complex and highly-developed society of Christendom." According to Mr. Stead Mazzini's lie is the truth, that not "a single one of the vast strides made upon the path of progress in our age was either suggested or consecrated by the Catholic Church."

Mr. Stead's real and great grievance is, that on his visiting Rome he found that neither the Pope nor the Cardinals would give him even the slightest encouragement to hope that the Church would abnegate her divine mission and change herself into a vast humanitarian organization, according to modern socialistic, philanthropic dreams. Because the English language is rapidly spreading through the world, and the English-speaking peoples seem destined to rule it, Mr. Stead thinks that the Church should become Anglicized or Americanized, and the Pope remove to London or New York.

The trouble with Mr. Stead is, that he seems not to have even the slightest idea that the Church is a divine supernatural constitution introduced into the world, but not of the world, having purposes and aims, and exercising powers far beyond those of mere human society.

CONFERENCES OF AGOSTINO DA MONTEFELTRO. Delivered in Rome during the Lent of 1889. Translated from the Italian by Charles Aubrey Ansell. With Approbatory Letter to the Translator by His Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. First series. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

CONFERENCES OF AGOSTINO DA MONTEFELTRO. Delivered in Rome during the Lent of 1889. Translated from the Italian by H. Dalby Galli. With Prefatory Letter by His Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Second series. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

These Conferences have so quickly attracted wide-spread attention, and been so highly commended by many eminent ecclesiastics, that it seems needless for us to say anything further in their praise. They treat of subjects of crucial importance. Some of these are profound mysteries; mysteries comprehending verities to which the natural world and the inner consciousness of all mankind alike bear testimony, and which challenge the attention both of the learned and the unlearned; verities which the shallow skepticism of our age denies, or pronounces unknowable. Others of these subjects are directly and immediately practical,

treating questions in which society and the different classes of society, and all men individually are directly and deeply interested.

With regard to the manner in which Father Agostino has dealt with all these subjects we are at a loss which to most admire; the almost exhaustive comprehensiveness of his treatment of them, or his simplicity, brevity and yet lucidity of statement and argument. It seems to us that the most untrained mind can easily take in and follow his thoughts, and that, on the other hand, the most thoroughly trained and cultivated intellect can profit by reading these Conferences.

It remains for us to inform and warn our readers that the two volumes before us are the only *authentic* and *entire* translation into English that has been published. We make this emphatic statement, because (with reluctance we say it) several garbled, spurious translations have been put forth by Protestants, as "adaptations" or "selections," which omit Father Agostino's powerful and luminous expositions of Catholic dogmas.

Life of St. Anthony of Padua, of the Order of Friars Minor. By *Father Servais Dirks*, Friar Minor. Translated from the French. New York: P. O'Shea, Publisher.

If it be true that good associations tend to improve us there can be no better reading for the faithful than lives of saints. For in perusing their lives we see how persons who, by nature were no better than ourselves, yet by more faithful and courageous co-operation with divine grace, distinguished themselves among their fellow human beings in those things which made them true benefactors of mankind and secured to them special honor and bliss in the eternal world.

The work before us is eminently calculated to be useful, especially in this our age, when so great laxity of opinion prevails as to the importance of implanting in the minds of children from their earliest years the seeds of religion and virtue, and training them in the practice of their religious duties. Thus was St. Anthony educated by his parents, and to this and his correspondence with the grace thus given him in increasing measure, may be traced his subsequent eminently holy life.

Incidentally the work furnishes valuable information on the state of Christian society at the beginning of the thirteenth century, on the heresies of that period, the conflicts between the Guelphs and Ghibellines in Italy, the Popes and the German Emperors, and the disorders produced by the Albigenses in Southern France.

Lux Vera. Par un Laïc Americain. Paris: Victor Palmé. New York: F. W. Chrosten. 1890.

A book of spiritual reading from an American layman evidently of French birth ought to mark an epoch in our Catholic literature. It is, as its author takes pains to assure us, a work done in good faith and in the interest of truth, with little pretension to fine writing, though the style is certainly very good. The writer's aim has been to make known the things of greatest importance to us and that men now-a-days concern themselves least about; to show us, he says himself, "What the body contains that is essential to the attaining of our end in creation, on earth, where our Creator has given us life that we may freely undergo a test of rather short duration. In other words, to explain what life is, what the body is, and how we acquire knowledge and cultivate the intellectual faculties; what the person or *ego* is in life, ... in death, and

after death; and, finally, what the soul is, and what attention it requires from us in order to attain eternal life." On this foundation our anonymous author has built a very useful superstructure, a store-house of spiritual information that may be used with great advantage by all who are acquainted with the French language. The book is a very handsome duodecimo volume of over four hundred pages, and has an extensive alphabetical index.

JESUS THE MESSIAH. By *Alfred Edershaim, M.A.*, Oxon., DD., Ph.D. Sometime Srinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint in the University of Oxford. An Abridged Edition of the Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. Author's Edition. New York: Anson D. F. Bardolph & Co. 38 W. 23d St. London: Songmans, Green & Co.

It is ever a difficult task to give due satisfaction in the abridgement of a work. The whole scheme of the original must be preserved, and yet omissions have to be made; naturally, there will be obscurities. The work before us has not escaped the lot of all abridgements. It has obscurities, and will, we are sure, give not a little dissatisfaction. We must say, however, that the author has made the most of a difficult task. We are much pleased with the reverential spirit that pervades the work. Of course, with the conclusions of the author, in many instances, we cannot agree; indeed, we cannot understand how calmly and deliberately the author could step aside from the plain, obvious meaning of Christ's words, for instance, when he "gives to Peter the keys to the kingdom of Heaven," and in another place wrests the text into a meaning far-fetched and untenable. The work is given to us in excellent form. It is fairly well written. The typography is very good. So that with those who hold the author's views it will undoubtedly meet with welcome acceptance.

THE FOUR GOSPELS EXAMINED AND VINDICATED ON CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES. By the *Most Rev. M. Heiss, D.D.* Second Edition. Milwaukee and Chicago: Hoffman Bros.

When the first edition of this learned and useful work was published, a few years ago, it was duly noticed in the REVIEW. We are glad to learn that the demand for it has continued so as to require a second edition, with a probability that that edition will soon be exhausted, and a third one will be called for.

In small compass, considering the importance of the subjects treated, the learned author has compressed lucid and valuable expositions of the authenticity of the Four Gospels, their freedom from errors and their chronology, an outline of the Life of Christ, His passion, death, resurrection and ascension.

The latter pages of the work are occupied with an exhibition of the manner in which the historical credibility of the Gospels is corroborated by secular history, and a dissertation on the most reliable text of the Gospels and their divine inspiration.

RATIONAL RELIGION. By *Rev. John Conway.* Milwaukee: Hoffman Bros. 1890.

We welcome this really admirable volume. It is truly *multum in parvo.* Rarely do we meet with a work which, in method and style, is better calculated to be extensively useful. As its author remarks in his unpretentious preface, "the fact that the book is intended for Catholic readers is no reason why it should not be useful for non-Catholics."

In the first four chapters the author briefly, yet lucidly, treats of God,

the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, and of Miracles. He then, in successive chapters, shows the relation of Faith and Reason, Faith and Physics, Faith and Evolution. The author then explains the relation of the Church to the Bible, and the meaning of the declaration: "Out of Church, no Salvation." Following these are a number of chapters briefly treating the subjects of Indulgences, Devotion to the Sacred Heart, Veneration of the Blessed Virgin, and the Immaculate Conception. The latter part of the work is occupied with the subjects of mixed marriages, divorce, the question of a life beyond the grave, and a dissertation on reading.

LUTHER ON EDUCATION, INCLUDING A HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION AND A TRANSLATION OF THE REFORMER'S TWO MOST IMPORTANT EDUCATIONAL TREATISES. By *F. N. Painter, A M.*, Professor of Modern Languages in Roanoke College, etc. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society.

Such highly laudatory notices were made of this book in several Protestant newspapers that we obtained a copy of it, by special request, from the house that published it, thinking we could find in it something worthy of thought, and perhaps of commendation. Yet after a careful examination we feel constrained to pronounce it one of the most pretentious, and at the same time unreliable, publications that has fallen under our notice for a long time. The first four chapters, on "Causes of the Reformation," the "Papacy and Popular Education," "Protestantism and Popular Education," and "Education before the Reformation," are simply misrepresentations of their respective subjects. The other chapters are little else than fulsome eulogies of Luther, attributing to him a character and ideas which history conclusively shows he did not possess.

GENERAL METAPHYSICS. By *John Reckaby, S. J.* New York, Cincinnati and Chicago. Benziger Bros. 1890.

This we think the most important, by far, of the series of manuals in Catholic philosophy given us by Father Reckaby. If such a thing were possible, we would like to see this book in the hands of every thinking man in the land. Would-be philosophers and so-called savants are doing much mischief in these our days. It is the story of the blind leading the blind; they speak of Being, of Existence, of Truth, and Goodness, yet they know not the meaning of the things of which they discourse so loftily and erroneously. Here, in the work before us, we have explained to us the true notion of Being, of Essence, and Existence; we learn here the true notion of Substance and Accident, and Causability, of Relation, of Space, and Time. Put this book, and its like, into the hands of men capable of understanding it, and your agnostics and materialists, your Ingersolls and Huxleys, will have lost their hold on them, and the world will be a great deal the better for it.

CATHOLICITY *vs.* PROTESTANTISM. Conversations of a Catholic Missionary with Americans. By *Rev. John C. Perrodin.* Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged; to which is added a Biographical Sketch of the Author. Milwaukee: Hoffman Bros., Printers to the H. Apostolic See, 413 E. Water. 1889.

Father Perrodin, the author of this book, was a man of unusual ability and extensive learning. He has not, in the volume before us, attempted to give us a special and complete treatise on any particular theme, but a series of conversations held with men, for the most part non-Cath-

olics, with whom, from time to time, he fell in. Unpretentious though it be, we feel sure the work will do much good, far more, we have not a doubt, than those of loftier aims. We especially like the chapters on Materialism, the Trinity, and the Spanish Inquisition. What the world needs is clear notions and right understanding of things; and on many most important subjects regarding religion Father Perrodin's work will supply this need. We wish it a full measure of success.

THE INNER LIFE OF THE VERY REV. PÉRE LACORDAIRE, O. P. Translated from the French of the Rev. Pêre Chocarne, O. P. With Preface by the *Very Rev. Father Aylward*, Prior Provincial of England. New and revised edition. New York: P. O'Shea.

Mr. O'Shea has done the public a real service by bringing out a new and revised edition of the "Inner Life" of the renowned Pére Lacordaire. The work has already been noticed in the REVIEW in terms of high commendation. We simply add that, apart from its highly interesting and edifying character as a biography, the clear light it throws upon one of the most critical periods of the Church in France during the latter part of the first half the present century gives it a permanent historical value.

AIDS TO CORRECT AND EFFECTIVE ELOCUTION. With Readings and Recitations for Practice. By *Eleanor O'Grady*, author of Select Recitations. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

This is one of the best books for practical use in Catholic parochial schools and academies that we know of. The selections have been judiciously made. Those that are not of high literary merit are nevertheless useful by the scope they give for elocutionary expression.

The directions respecting gesture, the carriage of the body, breathing, pitch, force, quality and cultivation of the voice, accentuation, emphasis, pronunciation, etc., are plain and practical, and much more copious than in most other text-books on elocution.

THE WAY OUT OF AGNOSTICISM, OR THE PHILOSOPHY OF FREE RELIGION. By *Francis Ellingwood Abbot, Ph D.*, Late Instructor in Philosophy in Harvard University. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1890.

The purpose of this work is to refute agnosticism on the grounds of pure reason. It is metaphysical throughout, and of course is intended for the perusal only of close thinkers. It is worthy of their attention, for whether they agree or not with the author in his assumed premises, or in the conclusions he arrives at, it will be highly suggestive to them.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

[The mention of books under this head will not preclude them from receiving further and fuller notice hereafter.]

GERALDINE; A TALE OF CONSCIENCE. By *E. C. A.* New Edition. New York: P. O'Shea. 1890.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND SOCIALISM. A Solution of the Social Problem. By *Condé B. Pallen, Ph.D.* St. Louis: B. Herder.

MONTH OF JUNE IN HONOR OF THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS. By the *Rev. A. Von Sever.* Milwaukee: Hoffman Bros.

DEVOTION TO THE HOLY GHOST. A Manual for the use of Seminarians, Priests, Religious, and the Christian People. By the *Very Rev. Dr. Otto Zardetti, V.G.* With a Letter of Introduction by the Rt. Rev. John Keane, D.D. Milwaukee: Hoffman Bros.